Dr. *STILLINGFLEET*

STILL AGAINST

Dr. *STILLINGFLEET:*

OR THE

EXAMINATION

OF

Dr. *Stillingfleet* againſt

Dr. *Stillingfleet*

EXAMINED.

By *J. W.*

LUKE XIX. XXII.

By thine own Mouth I Judge thee, Naughty Servant.

Printed in the Year, MDCLXXV.

Dr. STILLINGFLEET

STILL AGAINST

Dr. STILLINGFLEET:

OR THE

EXAMINATION

OF

Dr. Stillingfleet against

Dr. Stillingfleet

EXAMINED.

By J. W.

LUKE XIX. XXII.

By thine own Mouth I Judge

thee, Naughty Servant.

Printed in the Year, MDCLXXV.

The Preface.

After eighteen Months silence, Dr. Stillingfleet *was pleased to publish an Answer to a Treatise of a sheet and a half, penned by me with this Title,* Dr. Stillingfleet against Dr. Stillingfleet: *wherein I laid open the palpable Contradictions committed by him, in charging the* Roman *Church with Idolatry, danger of Salvation in her Communion, Fanaticisme, and Divisions in matters of Faith; endeavouring by this way to compel him* to be his own Executioner, *and* to make havock of his Arguments with his own Weapon. St. ag. St. pag. 14.

Hence the Dr. took a fancy to frame of me the following Character. Forthwith there starts up a young Sophister among them [*Catholicks*] and Pref. Gth. pag. 3.

and bids them be of good heart; for by letting fly at him ſome Squibs and Crackers, he did not queſtion, but he ſhould put this Monſter [*Dr. St.*] into ſuch a rage, as to make him fall upon himſelf: which deſign being highly approved, in a ſhort time came forth that dapper piece, called *Dr. Stillingfleet againſt Dr. Stillingfleet.* It was a notable plot, and cunningly managed, as the Reader may ſee (*and clearly too*) by the following Anſwer to it.

In one place he terms all his Adverſaries Books ſo many empty veſ-
Pref. Gen. pag. 6. ſels, thrown out for him to play with. *In another place he calls my Anſwer, and the Anſwer of that*
Pref. p. 1. *Learned Author* N. O. two elaborate Pamphlets; *charging me in almoſt every leaf with* Diſingenuity, *or* Sophiſtry, *or both. Sometimes he fancies me to be one of the* Roman-
pag. 13. tick Knights, which do hurt no-

where

where, but in paper, and their own imagination. *At another time he Parallels me with* a Juggler. *Now* Pag. 47. *he ſtiles me a* half-witted man, and a man without Senſe: *then* a Popiſh Page 50, Leviathan, *and then* a Puſionello; *affirming, that any man, whom I encounter, muſt be accounted a* Gyant. *Pag* 4. *he ſaies, that his Adverſaries* have beaten nothing but the Air, and themſelves, *p.* 2. *that they* have not ſaid one wiſe word, in a juſt Vindication of their Church from Fanaticiſme; *and p.* 51, *that* they plunge thoſe, who relie upon their word, into the depths of Atheiſme. *p.* 59. *he compares the* Roman *Church with the* Augean *Stable. p.* 10. *he avers, that what I ſay is* a baſe ſuggeſtion, *and* a ſly inſinuation. *p.* 8. abſurd, ſilly, and idle ſtuff. *p.* 39. vain, and ſophiſtical talk; *p.* 64. *that I deſigned nothing* but Sophiſtry, *and* trifling: *and p.*

43. *that* I ſought for nothing but words, to raiſe Cavils upon. *In fine, he cloſes up his Anſwer to me in*
Page 68. Don Quixots *ſtile*, Go thy way then for the Eighth Champion of Chriſtendome: enjoy the benefit of thy illuſtrious Fame: Sit down at eaſe, and relate, to thy immortal honour, thy mighty exploits: only when thou haſt done, remember, thou haſt encountred nothing, but the Wind-mills of thy own imagination: and the man, whom thou thoughteſt to have executed by his own hands, ſtands by, and laughs at thy ridiculous attempts. *Notwithſtanding this, and much more railing, and ſcoffing language, wherewith he lards all his works, the good man, out of his exceeding great humility, does plainly confeſs, in his anſwer to Mr.* Creſſy's *Epiſtle Apologetical, in the Preface to the* Benedictines, That he is yet to learn the
Page 4.

Art

Art, and Terms of Railing. *what? yet to learn the art and terms too, of Railing? well then, we may conclude, that he will never learn this art; for I am confident, there cannot be found in the world a man, who is able to teach him.* A Juggler, a man without ſenſe, an empty veſſel, a Leviathan, a Puſionello, baſe ſuggeſtions, ſly inſinuations, abſurd, ſilly, and idle ſtuff, vain and ſophiſtical talk, *and ſuch like, are (it ſeems) in this Drs. Dialect, terms only of pure civility. 'Tis in vain to examin, what Reaſon Dr.* St. *had to faſten upon my Companions, and my ſelf, ſuch ſcurrilous expreſſions. For we muſt not expect from him any Reaſon, or Proof, for what he ſaies.*

By theſe, and ſuch like Romantick Phraſes, which are the chief Ornament, that ſets off his works, we may eaſily gueſs, in what books this Dr. of Divinity has ſpent his

time, and that he is well verſt in Don Quixot, *the* Seven Champions, *and other* Romantick *Stories. Sure he erred in his Vocation; had he quitted all ſerious matters, and dedicated himſelf wholly to Drollery, and Romances, with two or three years under* Hudibras, *he would have been a Maſter in that Faculty: the Stage might have been a gainer by it; and the Church of* England *would have been no loſer.*

But who would imagin, that in the very ſame book, and within ſome few leaves, where he Characterizes his Adverſaries in ſuch reproachful language, he ſhould have the confidence to affirm, I have learn'd of him, *who when he was reviled, reviled not again,* not only to forbear reproaching them [*his Adverſaries*] in the ſame manner, (*is it, becauſe he reproaches them in a far higher manner?*) but to return them good for evil, and to pray for them, while they

Pref. p. 5.

they calumniate me. *what language is reproachful, if the forementioned expressions be not? If such be Dr. St's Prayers, who will be so mad, as to desire the Dr. to pray for him? or what Contradiction can there be more palpable, than to revile us in such a manner, and then to tell us, that he does not revile us, but only pray for us? Suppose, that one of as hot a temper as Dr.* St. *should call him* a Trifling Sophister, an empty Vessel, a Juggler, a man without sense, a half-witted man, a Romantick Knight, a Socinian Leviathan, a Pusionello, the 8th Champion of Christendom, and a leader into Atheisme; (*for such fine Epithets as these he is pleased to bestow, either upon all Catholicks in general, or upon some in particular:*) *should one* (I say) *draw such a Character of Dr.* St. *and then tell him,* 'Sir, *after all this,* 'I *have no intention to revile* 'you: *God forbid I should. I do*

'only

only pray for you. what opinion could any rational man conceive of such a person, who should so palpably, and so notoriously contradict himself? But alas! poor Dr. I pity him; he is so possest with the Spirit of Self-contradiction, that he can scarce write some few leaves without falling into one of his Fits: and even in this book, where he had made it his business to clear himself from so foul an imputation, he could not forbear to afford us fresh proofs, and instances thereof.

Neither am I ignorant, at what Dr St. aims with this manner of dealing. He would fain have me contest with him, either at Drolling, or Railing; and then he would be sure to have the better of me; and between Railing and Drolling we should both make a fine business of Religion; but I am far from any such intent: I know him too well. He is as pitiful at Arguing, as excellent at Drolling;

and

and I am reſolved to attack him on the weakeſt ſide, let him complain never ſo much.

Nor could the Dr. *have given the world a more pregnant Teſtimony, that his Adverſaries have pinched, and galled him, than by uſing ſuch unhandſome, and paſſionate expreſſions againſt them. For, all wiſe men do clearly underſtand, that whoever, in ſerious debates, (ſuch as thoſe of Religion are, with all perſons, who have any ſenſe of Religion in them) when he is cloſely preſs'd; in lieu of Anſwering, falls a Railing, or a Drolling, he yields himſelf for defeated: not to ſeem ſo to ignorant people, (who think, that ſo long as the party ſpeaks, he anſwers) he will needs ſay ſomething, though it be nothing to the purpoſe. The beſt way to deal with ſuch Adverſaries, is to preſs the Arguments which nettled them. The Spur, which touching only does make*

one

one kick, and wince; if often applyed, may tame and calm him.

And though one should be permitted, now and then, to sprinkle even serious Discourses with some sort of Railery; yet what prudence could it be in Dr. St. when he had no less than Nine several Treatises to answer, (besides others published before) issued forth against his Discourse concerning the Idolatry of the Roman Church, or some part thereof; and such as even Protestants were of opinion, he would have enough to do to answer them: what prudence could it be (I say) for him, in this Conjuncture, to mis-spend so much time in framing Romantick Characters of his Adversaries? Sure, had he been perswaded, that he could solidly answer them, he would presently have closed with them, and dispatch'd them; and not have stood off so long in Buffoonery. And the effect he has obtained by

this

this manner of answering seems to be, that having quite spent himself in these Drolling, *and Railing Fits, he has been forced to be beholding to a Person of Honour, (though unacquainted with Polemical Contests, as his Book sufficiently proclaims it) for answering his grave Adversary,* S. C. *and to* Dr. Whitby, *(though as that witty Author,* J. V. C. *tells us,* he vents Reasons, as young Children do Worms, heads and tails together) *for encountring even the Knight himself: For so he stiles his worthy Antagonist,* T. G. *And here I cannot but wonder: what?* Dr. St. *the* Champion of the Protestant Church, that Incomparable Man, that Prodigie of Ingenuity, and Learning, *had he not Courage enough to Combate the Knight, even when his own party was in so great expectation of the Engagement? Must he be forced to*

Epist. ad Cressyn. ag. Mr. Whitby.

pref. pag. 40.

Whitby *in his preface.*

substi-

ſubſtitute Whitby *in his place? But to ſuch ſhifts as theſe one will be put, who, when he hath ſerious buſineſs in hand, trifles out his time in fopperies. Yea, probably ſpeaking, he will hire ſome ſuch man (and there are many ſuch men) as* Dr. Whitby, *to Encounter the Squire too, for ſo he terms that Ingenious Writer,* J.S. *and the reſt of his Learned Adverſaries, who remain unanſwered. Yet it is great pity, he ſhould not anſwer them all himſelf. For if any of their Books have not hitherto arrived to the eſteem they deſerve, let the* Dr. *anſwer them in particular, and they will not fail to gain the Repute due unto them. For my own part I can aſſure him, that not only I my ſelf, but ſeveral others too, have a greater eſteem for my little Book, ſince the* Dr. *was pleaſed to anſwer it, than we had before: and I am ſo far from fearing his Replies, that I heartily*

tily desire he would Answer whatever hereafter I shall Publish, relating to Controversie.

The substance of the Reply was finished some few months after Dr. St. Examination *of my Book came forth: the reason why it was not published sooner, is, because I expected the Dr. should afford a particular answer to several Treatises, issued forth against his discourse of the* Roman Idolatry *(the book I attaqued) which remained yet unanswered; to the end that having seen what he could answer to the whole charge layed to him in this debate, I might the better order my Reply. But since the Dr. in so long a time has not yet been pleased to satisfie so just an expectation, for some good reasons he knows; I resolved without any farther delay, to set forth this Rejoynder; especially being prest thereunto by the invitation of several*

ral persons of Learning, both Diocesan and Catholick, who are perswaded, that the Dr. in the Examination *of my Book, has Layed himself thus open, as will manifestly appear by the following Treatise.*

An

The Contents.

CHap. I. *On ſuppoſition Dr.* St. *Contradicts himſelf in the way I inſiſt upon, all the charges he caſts upon the* Roman *Church, are falſe, and all their proofs void.*

Chap. II. *Several objections againſt the forementioned way of anſwering the Dr. proved inſignificant.*

Chap. III. *Other Objections anſwered.*

Chap. IV. *The Evaſions of the Dr. to clear himſelf from Self-contradiction, in charging the* Roman *Church with Idolatry, examined.*

Chap. V. *The Dr. palpably Contradicts himſelf, by affirming the* Roman *Church to be Idolatrous, and yet granting her to be a True Church.*

Chap. VI. *Another proof of the ſame intent drawn from the nature of the Idolatry, the Dr. fathers upon the* Roman *Church.*

Chap. VII. *The invalidity of the Drs. anſwers to our Propoſitions in particular.*

Chap. VIII. *Several quibbles againſt the aforeſaid Doctrine removed.*

Chap. IX. *The Drs. anſwer to my Appendix proved frivolous.*

Chap. X. *Concerning the other Contradictions committed by the Dr. in the Charges he laies upon the* Roman *Church.*

Chap. XI. *Some difficulties raised by the Dr. against my Judgment concerning his manner of proceeding, rejected.*

ERRATA.

PRef. post medium, *not to seem so*, r. *yet not to seem so.* fine, *Diocesan and Catholick*, r. *Protestants and Catholicks.* ib. *thus open*, r. *too open.* p. 47. l. 13. *would not*, r. *would it not* p. 68. l. 5. *charity of this*, r. *charity as this* p. 75. l. 18. *his excess*, r. *this excess.* l. 22. *this charity*, r. *his charity.* p. 100. l. 2. *nor among*, r. *now among.* p. 101. *so it is*, r. *so that it is.* p. 103. l. 13. *commanded*, r. *commandments* p. 123. l. 13. post illa verba, *honour due to God*, add *and then 'tis false.* p. 124. l. 8. *this part was*, r. *this was part.* p. 131. l. 8. *when*, r *then.* p. 132. l. 27. *does not own*, r. *does own.* p. 145. l. 25. *our own*, r. *his own.* p. 161. l. 27. *would not be*, r. *would be.* p. 185. l. 24. *answering*, r. *answer.* p. 186 l. 22. *and Idolater*, r. *an Idolater.* p. 188. l. 8. *any*, r. *as any* p. 194. l. 19. *universal truth*, r. *universal true.* p. 214. l. 26. *in any times*, r. *many times.* p. 220 l. 26. *detected*, r. *detested.* p. 221. l. 9. *are most*, r. *are more.* ib. l. 27. *to him treason*, r. *him to treason.* p. 239. l. 20. *that was*, r. *that this was.* p. 249. l. 23. *as he*, r. *as that he.* p. 265. l. 5. *being an*, r. *being of an.* p. 269. l. 2. *eighth, practises*, r. *eighth & their practises.* ib. l. 14. *to the same*, r. *the same.*

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

On ſuppoſition Dr. St. *contradicts himſelf in the way I inſiſt upon all the Charges he caſts upon the Roman Church are falſe, and all their proofs void.*

After Dr. *St.* had prefixed two Prefaces to his Book, the one of 82 pages, the other of 12: he ſets upon the examination of my Treatiſe; which with Introduction, Anſwer, and Appendix, contains only 21 pages, though in a cloſer letter. He deſignes to prove two things againſt me. 1. That on ſuppoſition he did contradict himſelf in the way I inſiſt upon, yet that would be no ſufficient Anſwer to his Book, *Page* 14. 2. That he is far enough from contradicting himſelf in

any one of the things I charge him with.

In reply to these two Points, I shall shew, 1. What follows if the Dr. contradicts himself: and hence will appear, whether on supposition he contraicts himsef in the way I insist upon, I answer his Book, or not. 2. That he palpably contradicts himself in the forementioned Charges, he lays upon the Roman Church. And that the Dr. may see I have a mind to deal fairly with him, I am very willing to be tried by the Learned men of our Two Famous Universities (where there are many as ingenious as Dr. *St.* and far more ingenuous,) not only whether I have not proved that the Dr. contradicts himself; but also whether, this being once proved in the way I insist upon, I do not invalidate and annul all the above-mentioned Charges he lays against the Roman Church, with all the Reasons, and Proofs he produces, or can produce to make them good.

To commence therefore the first Point of this Reply, If I have proved that Dr. *St.* has contradicted himself in

the

the aforesaid Crimes he imputes to the Roman Church (which is the supposition wherein he, and we speak in this first part) it manifestly follows, that I have obtained the design of my Book, couched in the Title thereof, *viz.* Dr. *Stillingfleet* against Dr. *Stillingfleet*; and if I moreover shew, that he still contradicts himself, I compleat also the Subject and Title of this Rejoynder, Dr. *Stillingfleet still against Dr. Stillingfleet*. For nothing else is aimed at in these Titles, but only to evince, that the Dr. did contradict, and persists to contradict himself. This is apparent from what I insinuated at the beginning of my Book, in these words, *page* 1. *My aim therefore in this short Paper, only is, to lay open the palpable contradictions of Dr.* St. *in imputing to the Roman Church the forementioned Calumnies.* And what more can be expected from a Writer, than to fill up the Subject and Design of his Discourse? Especially, if the Design be of great Consequence, as this is, according to what now follows.

Again, Self-contradiction being pro-

ved, as Dr. *St.* himſelf grants, *p.* 15. overthrows the authority of the Perſon, who ſtands convicted thereof. Now I conceive, that a ſheet and half of Paper was not ill-imployed in overthrowing (had it no other effect) the authority of one, who pretends to be a Pillar of the Proteſtant Church, and who gains more upon his Devotees by authority than by reaſon. So that, even according to Dr. *St's* confeſſion, ſelf-contradiction being once evidenced againſt him; we ought not to believe him in any thing he ſays, or alledges unleſs he recalls himſelf. For, to believe one is to take a thing upon his authority: and ſure no body ought to take any thing upon the authority and credit of one, who has loſt all authority and credit.

Beſides, whoever forces his Adverſary to grant manifeſt Contradictions, or ſhews that he grants them, according to the rigour of Logique, and cloſe arguing, he puts him in a ſack, he brings him to a *Non-plus*, and in plain vulgar Engliſh, he makes an Aſs of him, or ſhews him to be ſo, unleſs he recants.

recants. And can more than this be required of one to confute and confound his Adversary? or can one press him further than to a *Non-plus?*

Finally, Whoever grants and persists to grant palpable Contradictions, he may justly be posted up for a Mad-man. Should one (for instance) infected with the Plague say, and repeat that he is in very good health, but withal, that he is deadly sick of the Plague; could there be a clearer Symptome, that such a man's brains were distemper'd, than to hear him harp upon so palpable a contradiction? And there is no wise man who will have to do with Mad-men, no, not *in their Lucid Intervals,* as Dr. *St.* in his *Pref. p.* 11. gravely observes. For though Mad-men & Fools may sometimes say shrew'd things, yet no body who is perswaded they are such, can in prudence think himself bound to confute them, but rather to pity them; nor to solve their Objections, but to slight them: though it does not follow, because they are so, that all their Arguments are false, and their Objections null. This

I have ſaid, becauſe I perceive there are ſeveral, who are not ſenſible what groſs abſurdities do follow from ſelf-contradiction.

Nevertheleſs the Dr. ſtill urges, *That all this is no ſufficient anſwer to his Book.* For though he confeſſes, that ſelf-contradiction, being once evidenced againſt him, all his authority and credit is worth nothing, and conſequently he is not to be believed or credited in any thing he quotes or alledges, and all his Arguments which depend upon the truth of his Quotations, are not to be valued; nay, neither is one bound to make enquiry, whether his Quotations be true or not. For who is bound to make inquiry into the truth of what a Mad-man, or one that hath forfeited all his credit does ſay or alledge? Yet after all this he affirms, and vapours in almoſt every leaf of this firſt part, that his Arguments, eſpecially ſuch as do not depend upon the truth of his Allegations (and how few has he of ſuch Arguments?) remain firm, ſolid, and unanſwered? Now to diſabuſe the Doctor and his Partizans in this Point;

I ſhall demonſtrate that in the preſent Suppoſition, *viz. That he contradicts himſelf in the way I inſiſt upon, by laying to our charge the above mentioned crimes*: not only all the aforeſaid Aſperſions, but alſo all the Arguments which he produces, or can produce either from Authority or Reaſon, in proof of them, are void and of no force. And to this purpoſe I ſet down theſe following Principles; which, though appertaining only to Logique, this Dr. of Divinity ſeems to be ignorant of.

1. *When two Propoſitions contradict one another, both cannot be true; but either the one or the other muſt needs be falſe.* This is a manifeſt Principle of Natural Logique; wherefore if theſe two Propoſitions, *The Roman Church is a true Church*; *the Roman Church is an Idolatrous Church*, do contradict one another (as now we ſuppoſe they do) it evidently follows, that both of them are not true; but that either the one or the other is falſe. The ſame may be applied to the other Contradictions, wherewith I charge the Doctor in the progreſs of my diſcourſe.

2. *When of two Propoſitions that contradict one another, the one is true and taken for granted; the other is neceſſarily falſe.* This is alſo certain; otherwiſe both of them would be true; which is impoſſible according to the firſt Principle. If therefore the firſt of the two Propoſitions quoted above, *viz. The Roman Church is a true Church*, be true, and taken for granted, it manifeſtly follows, that the ſecond Propoſition, *viz. The Roman Church is an Idolatrous Church*, is falſe; ſuppoſing as we do ſuppoſe, that they contradict one another. The like alſo may be affirmed of the other contradictory Propoſitions; which we have laid to the Doctors charge.

Now the way I inſiſted upon all along in my diſcourſe is comprehended in theſe 4 Points ſet down in the beginning thereof, in theſe words. 1. *I ſhall in brief propoſe the Accuſation he frames againſt our Church.* 2. *I ſhall lay down ſome few Principles, either manifeſt in themſelves or at leaſt owned by Dr.* St. *and his Partizans.* 3. *From theſe Principles I ſhall in one or two Syllogiſms deduce the contra-*

tradictory of the Accuſation framed a-gainſt us. 4. *I ſhall cloſe up each Point with facing together the manifeſt Contradictions committed by* Dr. St. *in reference to the preſent Aſperſion.* Whence clearly appears, that though I aim in the laſt place, only at the Contradictions committed by the Doctor (and entitled thence my Book) yet I intended by the way to annul (as I have annulled) out of true and ſolid Principles, owned by Dr. *St.* and his Aſſociates, all the Accuſations he laid againſt us. For, what more can be required to annul them, than to prove their condictories to be true? And hence appears how frivolouſly the Dr. ſuppoſes (as in many places he ſeems to do) that I have done nothing elſe in my whole Book, but only ſet down the Contradictions committed by him: whereas of four Points, whereinto I divided each diſcourſe, one only is employ'd upon this Subject.

According to this my deſigne, inſinuated in the forementioned words; in each Point I took two Propoſitions; the one contained the Charge laid upon us by the Doctor; the other (which

proved to be oppoſite to the former, and is admitted as ſuch by Dr. *St.* in this firſt part) was granted by him, as in the reſpective places I demonſtrated. Neither do I ſee, that the Dr. as yet has denied any of ſuch Propoſitions, as far as they concern my intent: yea, we ſuppoſe now by common conſent, that he grants all ſuch Propoſitions; for how can he contradict himſelf in two Propoſitions (which is the Hypotheſis we proceed upon at preſent) unleſs he grants them both? Hence I inferred that the charges he laid againſt us were falſe, and of no force.

The Subſtance of our Diſcourſe in brief is this. If the Propoſitions alledged by us above, do contradict one another; and ſuch of them be true, and taken for granted, as are oppoſite to the Charges laid againſt us, ſuch Charges muſt neceſſarily be falſe. But the fore-mentioned Propoſitions do contradict one another, as we have proved, and the Dr. now admits; and ſuch of them as are oppoſite to the Charges laid againſt us are true, and taken for

granted; (for this is the way I insisted upon, and it is supposed here, that the Dr. grants them.) Therefore on Supposition that Dr. St. contradicts himself in the way I insisted upon, the Charges he lays against us must necessarily be false. And this is the common way Authors insist upon when they see, that their Adversary grants something true in it self, and opposite to the Conclusion he has undertaken to defend; they take for granted the former Proposition as favourable unto them, and wherein they agree with their Adversary, and infer thence the falsity of the later, wherein they dissent from him. But to shew also that I destroy all the Doctors Reasons too, wherewith he pretends to make good the aforesaid Charges, I add this third Principle.

3. *Whatever is brought, or can be brought in proof of a falsity; is either false, or inconclusive.* This is also evident. For there can be no true, real, and solid proof of a falsity; according to that Maxime, *Ex vero tantum non sequitur falsum.* Out of Truth alone no

no falſity can be legally inferred. For if the Concluſion be falſe, either all the Premiſſes are not true; or if they be ſo, they do not infer the Concluſion: whence I argue thus:

If the formentioned Charges which the Doctor imputes to the Roman Church be falſe, whatſoever he brings, or can bring in proof of them, is either falſe, or inconcluſive.

But on ſuppoſition the Dr. contradicts himſelf in the way I inſiſt upon, all ſuch Charges are falſe, as has been proved.

Therefore in the ſame ſuppoſition, whatſoever he brings, or can bring in proof of them, is either falſe or inconcluſive.

Whence appears how illogically Dr. *St.* urges, that though he ſhould contradict himſelf in the Aſperſions he caſts upon us, and in the way I inſiſt upon, yet the Reaſons he produces to evidence ſuch Aſperſions are good and ſolid. Wherefore I never affirmed, that meerly becauſe he contradicted himſelf, all his Arguments on both ſides of the contradiction were null. For one

part

part of the contradiction may be true, and the Arguments to prove it good and solid. True it is, that when one contradicts himself, his proofs on both sides cannot be good; since one part of the contradiction must needs be false; and there can be no good proof of a falsity. What therefore I intended to shew, was, That the Dr. by contradicting common Principles owned by himself in the Charges he lays upon us [see the Introduction to my Book] such Charges were false, and consequently their proofs void.

Neither do I ever aver, that what he alledges in proof of the aforesaid Charges, is determinately false, but disjunctively, that it is either false or inconclusive. And now let any rational man judge, whether this be not a sufficient answer to his Book, *viz.* not only to annul all the Charges he lays upon us, but all the Reasons too, and Arguments wherewith he pretends to make such Charges good, by demonstrating that on supposition he contradicts himself in the way I insist upon, all the above-mentioned Charges are void, and their

Reasons

Reaſons either falſe, or inconcluſive.

But the Doctor preſſes that I do not anſwer his Reaſons in particular; what then? if I cut them off all at once, what matter is it that I do not cut them off one by one? To deſtroy a houſe, 'tis of little concern whether we pull it down Tile by Tile, Brick by Brick, and Stone by Stone, till we have laid it in the duſt, or whether undermining the Foundations, we blow it up in a moment. Both ways are effectual to deſtroy a houſe: the difference is, that the firſt is tedious, the ſecond is quick and active. And as it would be very ridiculous for one to ſay, when his houſe was blown up, and ſhivered into pieces, that notwithſtanding it was not ſufficiently deſtroyed, becauſe (forſooth) it was not pulled down methodically ſtone after ſtone, and brick after brick; ſo it is extreme abſurd for Dr. *St.* to vapour, that though all the accuſations he frames againſt us are proved null, and all the Arguments he brings to make them out, are ſhewn to be falſe, yet his Book is not ſufficiently anſwered, becauſe all his Arguments

are

are not ſolved one by one, nor methodically anſwered.

Hence appears, that one may be ſecured (contrary to what Dr. *St.* ſeems to imagine *p.*29.) concerning the Truth & ſafety of the Roman-Catholick Religion, though he hears it charged with Idolatry by Arguments pretended to be drawn from ſeveral Topicks, whereof the Dr. makes uſe, without examining each Argument in particular. For certainly the Dr. will not oblige all Chriſtians, if they deſire to remain ſatisfied concerning the truth and purity of Chriſtian Religion, to examine in particular whatever *Lucian*, *Porphyrius*, and others of their Gang, have objected againſt it; though they pretended alſo to draw their Argments from the ſame, or the like Topicks, and had as good an Opinion, and with as much Reaſon too, of what they objected againſt Chriſtianity, as Dr. *St.* has of what he produces in oppoſition to the particular Tenets of Catholick Religion.

Is it not enough to the end one may remain ſatisfied concerning the Truth and ſafety of his Religion, notwithſtand-

ſtanding the Objections made againſt it, that he be convinced, that all ſuch Objections are falſe, and all the Reaſons alledged in proof of them invalid and of no force? Now to know that ſuch Objections are falſe, 'tis enough to be perſwaded that they contradict ſome common and true Principle aſſented unto both by the perſon who is to remain ſatisfied, and ſuch as make the Objections. For, what ever contradicts the Truth, is falſe: and if the Objections be falſe, 'tis evident that all their proofs are falſe or impertinent: and this is the method we obſerved throughout our whole Treatiſe, as is manifeſt.

The Dr. in his particular Preface deſcants at large againſt the manner wherewith his Adverſaries anſwer this Book of his. *One man* (ſays he) *picks out a Sentence here and there to anſwer; another, a page or two together: a third leaps from one thing to another, as if reſolved to paſs by the greateſt difficulties: But he is a man of courage indeed, that dares fall upon the rear, and begin to confute a Book at the end of it: So that if*

if he lives long enough, and get heart he may in time come to the beginning. Sure Dr. *St.* did expect we ſhould adviſe with him, which way we are to attack him. Let him evince, that we do not deſtroy the Aſperſions he caſts upon us, and their proofs, and he will do ſomething. But when we have beaten down all his Aſſertions againſt us, and his Arguments too, to cry out, that we have not ſtruck him in the right place, is very ridiculous.

This puts me in minde of what I have heard concerning a dapper young man, well ſet, yet of a low ſtature; who truſting to a great Buckler, wherewith he ſheltred himſelf, would encounter any one. Among ſeveral that worſted him, he met with one taler than himſelf, who over-reaching his Buckler, and giving him two or three ſhrewd blows over the head, ſtruck him to the ground together with his Buckler. Then the poor man, after he had ſprawled awhile, having recovered himſelf, began to enveigh againſt his Adverſary, ſaying, *A Pox take ye, could you not ſee my Buckler?* There is no need for me

to make the Application. As it would therefore be of little comfort for us, if we have not deſtroyed his Book, that we attacked him the right way: So in all reaſon it ought to be of little comfort for the Dr. if we have deſtroyed his Book, that we did not ſet upon him that way, which he imagined to be the only right and methodical way to impugn him. Certainly Dr. *St.* is a happy man, if he can ſolace himſelf with ſuch pitiful excuſes as theſe.

In particular he complains of *N. O.* and *J. S.* becauſe, as he ſays, *Gen. Pref. pag.* 4. 40. *They ſteal quite behind his Book, and ſhew a particular ſpite at the Dragons Tail.* The reaſon why he ſays thus is, becauſe they confute the later end of his Book. But if they annul the part they ſet upon, what matters all this? what General, who had his Army routed by the Enemy, did ever think it a ſufficient excuſe, to ſay, *That they fell upon the rear, and ſo routed him?* And though I do not affirm, that Dr. *St*'s Book hath neither head nor tail, yet I may with truth aver, that his Book reſembles a Monſter in this, that it has

the

the head, where it ſhould have the tail; for he ends with the Principles of his Religion: whereas, according to the natural method of writing, he ſhould have begun not ended with them. Since therefore the Dr. ends where he ſhould begin, what wonder is it, that theſe two worthy Authors ſhould begin, where he ends!

CHAP. II.

Several Objections againſt the fore-mentioned way of anſwering the Dr. *proved inſignificant.*

THis way of anſwering is *new*, as the Dr. will needs have it. Is not this to trifle out the time, and plainly to acknowledge that he is deſtitute of a ſolid reply? If the way I have taken be a *true* and an *effectual* way to confute his Book (as we have ſhewen it is) of

what damage is it, that it be a *new* way? Moreover, this manner of confuting I have insisted upon, cannot seem *new* to any one, who is acquainted with the Schools. For though the Defendant may produce several Reasons to establish the Conclusion he undertakes to maintain; yet the Opponent commonly sets upon the Conclusion, without taking notice of the Reasons; especially when he is perswaded that the Conclusion is false: and if he destroys the Conclusion, all the Reasons produced in defence thereof, fall to the ground. And certainly a Defendant would be laught at, who after he had been defeated by his Adversaries, and had his Conclusion annulled, should cry out, *Though the Conclusion be false, yet the Reasons are good and solid*: or should not be able to afford any other answer, than that *the Argument made against him was* new, *and never before heard of by him.*

Besides, should one destroy all the Arguments one by one, wherewith his Adversary pretends to make good the *Thesis* he defends; yet in rigour he would

would not therefore (unleſs he adds ſome other principle) deſtroy the *Theſis*; but only ſhew, that the Defendant does not prove it well. But if one deſtroys the *Theſis* (which is a more compendious way) it is evident, that he annuls all the Reaſons and Arguments brought in proof thereof. Yea, if this way of not anſwering each Argument in particular, be New, I was not the Inventer of it. For Dr. *St.* himſelf, in his Diſcourſe of Idolatry, (which was publiſhed before my Book ſaw Light) *p.* 558. affirms, That *the Principles of Proteſtant Religion*, which he ſets down at the end of that work, *are a ſufficient Anſwer to Proteſtancy without Principles*; whereas it is manifeſt, that in his whole Appendix of Principles he does neither State the Controverſie plainly, nor examin the proofs that Learned Author produces, nor apply diſtinct Anſwers to his Arguments, fairly repreſented in their own words: which is what he ſayes Proteſtant Writers obſerve, *Pref. pag.* 3. when they ſet themſelves to Anſwer our Books: And I appeal to the Judgment of any

Impartial perſon, who has taken the pains to peruſe his late Anſwers to the formentioned book, *Proteſtancy without Principles, to Reaſon and Religion, and to the Guide in Controverſie*, whether he has performed all the aforeſaid Formalities, which he requires of us, *ibid. pag.* 4. and whether he does not pick up here and there ſome Sentences to Anſwer, or one Chapter or two together, or leaps from one thing to another, as if reſolved to paſs by the greateſt difficulties; or omits whole Diſcourſes, as the fourth and fifth Diſcourſe in the *Guide in Controverſie*: *All theſe little Arts and Shifts* in us (ſais the Dr.) are *either plain Acknowledgments of a baffled Cauſe*, or *an Argument of a weak and unskilful Management*. Whereas all theſe very ſame Arts in the Dr. muſt be pregnant proofs of a good Cauſe, and of a skilful management thereof.

But ſome will ſay, That Dr. *St.* may be permitted to anſwer as he pleaſe, and without tying himſelf to the abovementioned Formalities, becauſe he has learned a ſecret proper to himſelf, *to draw off all the ſpirit of a book in two or three lines*

lines, (Pref. Gen. pag. 30.) and all the reſt he leaves behind, (*viz.* all that he cannot Anſwer, which is the far greateſt part of his Adverſaries Books) is only *Phlegm*, and *Caput mortuum*. But we, poor Souls, to whom Dr. *St.* has not as yet had the Charity to impart this Secret, unleſs we anſwer his book Chapter by Chapter, Paragraph by Paragraph, and Point by Point, we do nothing. Whoever deſires to ſee more concerning Dr. *St.* 's manner of writing, let him read the Firſt Letter, written by the Worthy Author of *Some General Obſervations upon Dr.* St. *'s Book, and way of Writing.*

Now the true reaſon why Dr. *St.* frets ſo much at my manner of dealing with him, ſeems to be, becauſe he thought it a diſparagement, that ſo little a Book ſhould be publiſhed againſt ſo great a Dr. and that I ſhould compel him, in no more than a ſheet and a half, to fall foul on himſelf, and to be his own Executioner. The Dr. ſeems to be in the vulgar Errour of ſuch, as meaſure Books by their Bulks, and Imagin, that in a little book, ſuch as he ſtiles

Rats and *Flies*, there can be no great thing. But he muſt know, that a Rat can overcome an Elephant, and that Flies have been able to rout vaſt Armies.

Hence any one may ſee, what Motives I had, to take this way of Anſwering Dr. *St.* whereof he will needs make ſo great a Miſtery. My intention was to diſpatch him in ſhort, and to ſet forth a little Book againſt him: which I could never have performed, ſhould I have anſwered all his Arguments one by one, and obſerved all the other Formalities, he will needs oblige us to. Beſides, the Conveniencies of a little book are very great. It is eaſily made, eaſily Printed, eaſily bought, and eaſily read: and conſequently thereby are ſpared two precious things, Time and Money. About a Thouſand Copies of Dr. *Stillingfleet againſt Dr. Stillingfleet* went off in three weeks or a month, and had I Printed as many more, I might have diſpatch'd them all: On the contrary, a great Volume cannot be made without great labour, nor Printed without great Expences: and when it is made and Printed, few buy it, and fewer have time

time or patience to read it over. A Peſtilent Book may be daſh'd at the beginning with a ſhort Paper, before it ſpreads its Venome: but this being once ſpread, a whole Volume will ſcarce ſuffice to quell it. A Pail of Water may quench a Fire, before it extends itſelf: whereas a far greater quantity will not be effectual to avert its fury, if it once makes it ſelf maſter of a houſe.

But you will ſay, (as many do) that ſome deny the *Roman* Church to be a true Church; which is to deſtroy, and pull down the very ſtreſs, whereon is builded our whole Diſcourſe. I ſay alſo, that many deny the Antient Fathers; others, all General Councils; and others, the very Scripture it ſelf: nay what is there, that ſome do not deny? May we not therefore Argue well out of Fathers, Councils and Scriptures, againſt ſuch as admit theſe Topicks? Neither is it neceſſary to prove alwayes our Concluſion out of General Principles, which all, or moſt, agree unto: otherwiſe we ſhould never argue in matters of Religion out of certain Books of Scripture, which Jews, and ſome Sectaries do de-

uy

ny, againſt ſuch as do allow of thoſe Books. Particular Principles come neerer the Concluſion we pretend to prove: & conſequently, if they be true, & aſſented unto, by both parties, they carry us a ſhorter way to the Truth we aim at.

Moreover, though ſome deny the *Roman Church to be a true Church*, yet many grant it; and it is the Senſe of the *Engliſh* Church, and the Perſwaſion of all Learned Proteſtants, as many of their own Profeſſion aver, according to what we have quoted in *Dr. Stillingfleet againſt Dr. Stillingfleet*, pag. 3, 4. Dr. *St.* himſelf aſſents unto it, Fanaticks approve of it, and *Latitudinarians*, who maintain all Religions to be true, ſtoutly defend it; and many times they ſeem angry with us, that we ſhould queſtion, whether they grant our Church to be a True Church. Of thoſe, who profeſs themſelves Chriſtians in *England*, only ſome rigid Presbyterians deny it: yea, the title of Reformers of the *Roman* Religion, which Moder Sectaries take upon them, does manifeſtly imply, that the *Roman* Religion & the Reformed Religion as they ſtile it, is the ſame in ſubſtance,

and

and different only in Accidentals: and conſequently if theirs be true, ours muſt alſo be true: for it is impoſſible, that a true Church, and not a true Church, ſhould be the ſame in Subſtance. To Reform a Church is not to deſtroy its Eſſence, but to redreſs its Diſorders. The Apoſtles were not ſent to Reform Paganiſm: and why? becauſe they Deſtroyed it; bringing in, in lieu thereof, Chriſtian Religion, of a different Subſtance and Nature. The fire deſtroys wood, and Refines Gold; becauſe it changes the very Subſtance of Wood into Aſhes; but it only takes away the droſs of Gold, and leaves its Subſtance, and Eſſence untouched.

Dealing therefore with the forementioned Perſons, as in this Treatiſe I do, I might with much reaſon take that propoſition for granted; and ſhould I encounter an Adverſary, who denies the *Roman* Church to be a true Church, I would ſet upon him another way, and prove it to be a True Church: which is not hard to do. For different wayes are to be taken with different Adverſaries, and what is a ſolid proof againſt one, is

of

of no force againſt another. I confeſs therefore, that all the Arguments I have framed againſt Dr. *St.* grounded upon this Principle, *The Roman Church is a true Church* are of no force, with ſuch as deny That Principle, unleſs firſt I prove it. In the ſame manner all the Arguments, grounded upon the Authority of the Fathers, and Councils, are of no force againſt Fanaticks, who ſlight the Fathers and Councils, unleſs their Authority be firſt eſtabliſhed.

Hence appears, how inſignificantly Dr. *St.* and his *Cabal*, threaten us that if we preſs them out of this Principle, *The Roman Church is a True Church*, freely granted by them; they will deny it, and fall back from what they have yielded unto; and that we ſhall get nothing elſe thereby, but to make them leſs Charitable towards us, and the difference between us wider. For in the ſame manner they might threaten us, when we argue againſt them out of Councils and Fathers, admitted by them, that if we preſs them they will deny their Authority: Neither ſhould any one preſs another out of Scripture, though

though granted by him; for fear, leaſt if he be preſs'd, he will deny Scripture, and become a Turk, or a Pagan. Nay, ſince one cannot convince another, but out of what he has aſſented unto, were this way of dealing warrantable, any one might eaſily elude all Arguments whatſoever. For either we urge our Adverſary, or not: if not, how ſhall we convince him? if ſo, he may ſtave off the Conviction, according to Dr. *St.*'s manner of dealing, by threatning us, that if we urge him, we ſhall get only this of him, that he will deny what already he has granted, Doubtleſs the Scholars of the Illuſtrious Univerſity of *Cambridge* would be aſhamed of their Dr. *St.* ſhould they hear him ſay, in a publick Diſpute to his Adverſary, *Do not preſs me; for if you do, I'le deny what I have already granted.*

Finally, ſince this Aſſertion, *The Roman Church is a True Church*, is common, aſſented unto, not only by Catholicks, but alſo by Proteſtants of the *Engliſh* Church, and others of different Profeſſions, as we have ſeen: But this other, *The Roman Church is Idolatrous*, is denyed

ed both by Catholicks, and ſeveral learned and zealous Proteſtants: and ſince either the one, or the other of theſe Aſſertions is to be recalled, ſuppoſing they contradict one another, 'tis more reaſonable to recal the latter, than the former, becauſe *cæteris paribus*, particular Sentiments are to yield to common Principles, when they run Counter.

But what is the reaſon, that Dr. *St.* who profeſſes himſelf a mortal enemy to the *Roman* Church, does not deny it to be a true Chuch, recalling what heretofore he has aſſerted? yea, he is ſo far from recalling it, that he ratifies, and grants ſeveral times, in this Examination of my book, in plain terms, what he had affirmed in his *Rational Account*, that the *Roman Church is a True Church.* I inſinuated in my Book, in the place above quoted, ſeveral motives, why Dr. *St.* and his Aſſociates, do unanimoſly aver the *Roman Church* to be *a True Church*: Becauſe upon this account they ground the pretended Moderation and Charity of the *Engliſh* Churh, wherewith they endeavour to inveigle unwary minds: and if they deny

ny the Roman Church to be a true Church, either they muſt confeſs that there was no true viſible Church in the world for many hundred of years be- *Luther* and *Calvins* time, or they are ſhrewdly put to it when we urge them to ſhew us which that true viſible Church was, diſtinct from the Roman.

Yet another particular reaſon moved Dr. *St.* not to recal what he had aſſerted concerning the Truth of the Roman Church. For he could not but ſee that ſhould he deny the Roman Church to be a true Church, he muſt either deny the Proteſtant Church to be a true Church, or ſeek out other grounds to prove the truth thereof different from thoſe he laid down in his Rational Account. For the Diſcourſe he makes in that Book to eſtabliſh the truth of the Proteſtant Religion in ſubſtance is this: *Whatever Church holds all ſuch points as were held by all Chriſtian Societies of all Ages, & acknowledged by* Rome *it ſelf; has all that is neceſſary to the being of a true Church, and by Conſequence is a True Church. But ſuch is the Proteſtant Church, as he affirms: Therefore accord-*

ing

ing to his Principles it is a true Church. And descending to particulars, he says, *That all Churches, which admit the Antient Creeds* (as the Roman Church evidently does) are true Churches.

Now these Principles whereon the Dr. bottoms the truth of Protestancie, do necessarily imply that the Roman Church is a true Church. For, either the Roman Church acknowledges what is sufficient to constitute the being of a true Church or not; if she does, she must necessarily be a true Church. If she does not, how can Dr. *St.* assert, *That the Roman Church, with other Christian Societies acknowledges what is sufficient to constitute the being of a true Church?* Wherefore, unless Dr. *St.* grants the Roman Church to be a true Church, that Principle whereon he grounds the truth of Protestancie, *viz.* That it admits whatsoever is admitted by all Christian Societies, and acknowledged by *Rome* it self, is of no force. So that unless Dr. *St.* maintains the truth of the Roman Church, he must either confess that Protestancie is no true Religion, and that the Account he has

has hitherto given concerning the grounds of Proteſtancy, is void and irrational; or ſeek out other Principles to prove it. Now if Dr. *St.* has ſuch a pike againſt the *Roman* Church, that to the end he may prove her Idolatrous, or no true Church; he cares not to unchurch Proteſtancy, or at leaſt to cancel whatever he has yet ſaid to ſhew, that it is a True Religion; I conceive that Proteſtants will give him little thanks for his pains. But the truth is, that Dr. *St.* if we reflect well upon his works, cares not what becomes of Proteſtancy, nor Chriſtianity neither; ſo that he may, according to his fancy, deſtroy Popery. But we care as little for his attempts, if he cannot deſtroy Popery, without undermining Chriſtianity.

The Dr. ſeems, in ſeveral places of his Anſwer, ſilly to inſinuate, as if he had only been heretofore of opinion, that the *Roman Church is a true Church*; but that now he has altered his Opinion; and it can be no diſparagement for a man to recal what heretofore he aſſerted. To this purpoſe he alledges, *pag.* 16. the *Recognitions of Bellarmin*, who, in

imitation of St. *Augustin*, retracted some former Errours delivered by him. But where, I pray, has D. *St.* made any book of Recognitions, recalling his former Errours? though he might make a just Volume upon that Subject, and begin it with the Recantation of what he sets down in his *Irenicon*, destructive to the Episcopal Dignity; which he is loth to do; for he sees, that book endeared him to the Presbyterian party; whom he seems to Court. I confess, that it is no blemish for a man, when he is better informed, to recal the Errours which heretofore he assented unto. For, to err, is a frailty of men; but to persevere obstinately in an Errour, (as necessarily he must do, who persists in a palpable Contradiction) is a brutish obstinacy: and what greater disparagement than this can there be for a rational man!

Now Dr. *St.* not only heretofore, but even in this present book, after he had Charged the *Roman* Church with *gross Idolatry*, affirms, that she is a *true Church*, (as shall hereafter appear) without having ever yet recalled that

Propo-

ſition: and conſequently he perſiſts to contradict himſelf, as he now admits.

Whence follows, that the Allegation of *Bellarmin's Recognitions*, or *Recantations* was nothing to the purpoſe. For it is as if one ſhould argue thus; *Bellarmin*, though he erred, yet becauſe he recalled his Errours, making a Book of *Recognitions*, did not loſe his Reputation, neither did he deſerve, that we ſhould ſlight what he ſaies: Therefore Dr. *St.* who has erred, and does perſiſt to err, who has, and does ſtill contradict himſelf, without ever having recalled his Errours, does not deſerve we ſhould ſlight what he affirms; or thus; Saint *Peter*, though he ſinned grievouſly, yet becauſe he did ſincerely repent, was a great Saint: Therefore ſuch as have ſinned grievouſly, and never repent, are great Saints. Let Dr. *St.* imitate *Bellarmin*, and recal his former Errours, and he will loſe nothing, no, not his Authority: which notwithſtanding, as he himſelf affirms, Self-contradiction being once proved, eſpecially if it be inſiſted upon, is utterly overthrown.

But we muſt reflect, That ſuch as re-

cal their former Opinions, or Tenets, are in two ſorts. Some recal Tenets heretofore aſſented unto, becauſe they find them inconſiſtent with Errours, which they are reſolved to defend; as if one (for inſtance) who being not able to vindicate *the General Principles of Chriſtianity*, without confeſſing the particular Tenets of the *Roman* Church to be true, ſhould out of hatred to ſuch particular Tenets, deny the *General Principles of Chriſtianity*; which before he had yielded unto. Such men as theſe, are far from deſerving any Commendation, for recalling their former perſwaſions; but rather ſhew an inveterate obſtinacy, and odium againſt the Truth: and amongſt ſuch men, Dr. *Si.* muſt be enrolled, ſhould he, to defend the Idolatry of the *Roman* Church, deny her to be a *true Church*, contrary to the Truth he has ſo often acknowledged, and to the very Grounds, whereon he builds the truth of Proteſtancy. For, though I do not allow of his Grounds, yet I Aſſent to the Truth of the *Roman-Catholick* Religion; which is evidently thence inferred.

Others

Others, to embrace the Truth, which in proceſs of time they have diſcovered, recal former Tenets, contrary thereunto, as St. *Auguſtin*, and *Bellarmin* did. So do many, who finding Proteſtant Religion to be falſe, relinquiſh it, and embrace the *Roman*, oppoſite thereunto. Such men as theſe ſhew great ingenuity, and ſincerity; and by revoking ſuch Opinions, with all Wiſe men, rather gain, than loſe Authority, or Reputation. And among theſe men Dr. *St.* would deſerve to be liſted, if he would be pleaſed to recant, and declare plainly to the world, that when he Charged the *Roman* Church with *Idolatry*, *Fanaticiſm*, *Diviſions in matters of Faith*, *danger of Salvation in her Communion*, and other Corruptions, he over ſhot himſelf, as ſeveral, even of his own Friends, confeſs he did, at leaſt in the Charge of Idolatry.

Beſides, when one recalls an Opinion, as inconſiſtent with the Truth, to which he had heretofore aſſented, he alſo virtually recalls all the proofs thereof, acknowledging them to be either falſe, or unconcluding. And ſince what

St. *Auguſtin*, and *Bellarmin* ſtood to after their *Retractations*, contradicted what they held before, 'tis manifeſt, that their proofs, either on the one ſide or other, were void: and conſequently, recalling ſuch Opinions, they recalled alſo, their proofs of them. And here I cannot but reflect, that Dr. *St.* ſeems to liſt me (*pag.* 14.) among ſuch as he terms *Revolters from the Church of England*. Thanks be to God, I was bred a *Roman-Catholick*: my Parents and Anceſtors were of the ſame Religion, and ſuffered much for their conſtancy therein. And I can aſſure the Dr. that, for all I have ſeen in him, I am ſo far from being ſtartled in my Religion, that I am rather confirmed therein. For a weak impugnation of the Truth is a confirmation thereof: and if God ſhall be pleaſed to give me his Grace, not to quit the General Principles of Chriſtianity, I ſhall never, upon the account of what Dr. *St.* ſaies, relinquiſh the particular Tenets of the Catholick Church.

Many ask me, what matters it, that Dr. *St.* palpably contradicts himſelf, and perſiſts ſo to do? which is the ſame

as

as if they ſhould ask me, what matters it if Dr. *St.* be a Madman? And to ſay the truth, it matters very little for the Publick good, that he be ſo: but it matters very much, that being ſo, he ſhould be commonly reputed a Wiſeman. For, what greater damage can be imagined, than that the people be guided by a Madman in affairs of ſo great concern, as thoſe of Religion are? Neither can one do a greater ſervice to the Common-wealth, than to diſcover their Guides to be mad, if really they be ſo. Neither can there be a better way to diſcover it, than by ſhewing they grant, and perſiſt to grant, palpable Contradictions.

Moreover, they might ſay the ſame, in caſe I had attacked any other particular Doctor of the Proteſtant Church; (for Dr. *St.* carries as great a vogue as any other) asking me, what matters it, if I force ſuch a Doctor to manifeſt Contradictions; and by conſequence bring him to a *Non-plus*? So that were this Objection juſtifiable, it would prove, that it is of no concern, to defeat, and bring to a *Non-plus* any particular

Adversary: which is certainly false, and repugnant to the common practice of all Learned and Zealous men.

Besides, had I proved only, that the Charges which Dr. *St.* laies upon us, did contradict some particular Tenet, held only by the Dr. and some few of his Partizans; though that would have been sufficient to have baffled him, yet it would not have been of so great moment. But I have shewn, that the Aspersions he casts upon us, do contradict General Principles, assented unto, not only by Dr. *St.* and all *Roman-Catholicks*, but also by all Learned Protestants, Members of the *English* Church, and by many others of different Professions: and consequently I convince all such, that the forementioned Aspersions are false, as being repugnant to True and General Principles granted by them: and that whatever is produced in proof of them, is false, or impertinent. And what more can be required, in order to wipe of, from the minds of such persons, the aforesaid Calumnies!

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

Other Objections Answered.

BY what hitherto has been discuss'd, it plainly appears, that the instance of a Lawyer at the Bar, alledged *page* 16. by Dr. *St.* is of no force against us; Because, should a Lawyer produce at the Bar no other proof, but such as is repugnant, not only to his own particular Tenets, but also to the common perswasion of the Judges, and of all the Learned Lawyers of the Kingdom; yea and to the unanimous consent of the Parliament; sure his proofs would be held for frivolous. This is what succeeds in our present Case. Dr. *St.* Charges us with Crimes, repugnant, as he himself now admits, to this Principle, *The Roman Church is a True Church*, not only granted by him, and all *Roman-Catholicks*, but also by all Learned Divines of the *English* Church, as suitable to her Sense, and Doctrine, as they themselves confess, and by several other of different

different Professions. All such persons therefore (and these are all with whom we now dispute) ought to hold the forementioned Accusations for void, and frivolous.

Moreover, should a Lawyer plead to prove one to be a notorious Traytour, and yet at the same time should plainly declare at the Bar, that he is, and has ever been, a Loyal, and faithful Subject, could Dr. *St.* or any other, think, that any account were to be made of such a Barrister; who should so openly Contradict himself? This is what the Dr. does. He pleads to shew our Church to be *Idolatrous*, and yet at the same time he sincerely confesses, that she is a *true Church*, standing to what he has formerly asserted: and he admits at the present that the forementioned Accusation contradicts this his Assertion, as really it does, no less then these two Propositions do contradict one another, *Such a man is a notorious Traytour, but yet he is a faithful Subject.* What account therefore can any prudent man make of this Accusation of Dr. *St.* or consequently of the proofs he alledges in favour thereof?

Finally,

Finally, though a Lawyer may be permitted, when required thereunto, by his Clyent, after he has informed him of his Judgment, to propoſe all the proofs he can in his favour, though his particular opinion be, that his Clyent has no right to what he pretends; becauſe the Judge, who is to decide the Plea, may be of a contrary perſwaſion. Yet ſure Dr. *St.* will not affirm, that what he produces in his diſcourſe concerning the *Idolatry* of the *Roman* Church, is only to ſhew (in order to ingratiate himſelf with the Presbyterians) what may be ſaid upon that Subject; and not becauſe he is of opinion, that the *Roman* Church is *Idolatrous*. For if ſo, he might as well have publiſhed ſome book againſt the Divinity of our Saviour, or againſt a Deity, as he hath publiſhed the forementioned Diſcourſe, to prove the *Roman* Church *Idolatrous*; and then tell us, if he be urged, that having received a Fee from *Socinians*, or *Atheiſts*, he did it only to ſhew, what might be ſaid againſt the Divinity of our Saviour, or a Deity, and not becauſe he is of opinion that there is no God,

God, or that Christ is not God. Yea, he might say in like manner, that what ever he has produced hitherto, to prove the truth, and Orthodoxness of the Protestant Religion, was only to shew (to the end he might promote his Interest among Protestants) what might be alledged in favour of their Religion; and not that he thinks it True, and Orthodox.

The Dr. seems to value much a Case he produces, *pag.* 20. in order to shew the Insufficiency of our manner of Answering him: his words are these; *I will put a Case parallel to this. Suppose one of the Church of* Judah *should have called the Church of* Israel, *in the time of* Jeroboam, *a true Church, because they acknowledged the true God, and did believe an agreement in that common acknowledgment to be sufficient, to preserve the Essentials of a Church among them; and afterwards the same person should go about to convince the Ten Tribes of their Idolatry in worshipping God by the Calves of* Dan *and* Bethel. *Would this be thought a sufficient way of Answering him, to say that he contradicted himself by granting them a*

True

True Church, and yet charging them with Idolatry? Whereas the only true Consequence would be, that he thought some kind of Idolatry to be consistent with the being of a Church. He adds, that such a person might justly say, *that they made a very ill use of his Charity*; and *that if they could prove to him, that the Idolatry he fathered upon them, did Un-church them*; *the Consequence of it would be, that his Charity must be so much the less, and that he must deny them to be a true Church.* This is Dr. *St.*'s Case; whereby he pretends to evince the invalidity of our manner of Answering him.

But before I examin this Case of the Dr. I will put a Case Parallel to ours, to shew, that the way we have taken to Answer him is sufficient. Suppose that a *Jew*, (for why may not a *Jew* be as Charitable, and Zealous too, as Dr. *St.* and yet Contradict himself, as he does?) should, out of a pretended zeal, Charge Christian Religion, even when it was in its greatest purity, with the same kind of Idolatry, as Dr. *St.* fastens upon us; and that notwithstanding at the same time, carried away with the

the like Charity, as the Dr. is, ſhould confeſs, that Chriſtian Religion was then, not only a True Religion, but alſo a Pure, Safe, and Sound Religion: and with ſuch a Religion even Dr. *St.* affirms, the Idolatry he Charges us with, yea all kind of Idolatry, to be inconſiſtent, as will appear hereafter. Now in this Caſe might not the Dr. in vindication of Chriſtian Religion, ſay and prove too, (for I do not aver, as he ſeems to inſinuate, that it is enough to ſay he is guilty of ſelf-contradiction, unleſs one proves it) that ſuch a man did contradict himſelf, in granting Chriſtian Religion to be a true and ſound Religion, and yet Charging it with Idolatry? Could he rationally ſay, that the only true Conſequence in that caſe would be, not that ſuch a perſon contradicted himſelf, but that he thought ſome kind of Idolatry to be conſiſtent, not only with the Being, but alſo with the Soundneſs of a Church? or ſhould he think ſo, would he not therefore contradict himſelf? and having proved to him, that the Idolatry he fathered upon the Chriſtian Religion, was deſtructive

ſtructive to the Soundneſs of a Religion, would the Conſequence be, that the Charity of ſuch a perſon muſt be ſo much the leſs, and that he muſt deny hereafter the ſoundneſs of Chriſtian Religion? Would it not be a ſufficient way of Anſwering ſuch a man, to demonſtrate unto him, that the Charge of Idolatry caſt by him upon Chriſtian Religion was falſe; and conſequently that what ever he produced in proof thereof, was void? and to demonſtrate this unto him, would not be enough to ſhew, that ſuch a charge did contradict a Principle, *viz.* the Soundneſs of Chriſtian Religion, true in it ſelf, and aſſented unto by both parties?

This is juſt our caſe with Dr. *St.* For, as that *Jew* does contradict himſelf, by granting Chriſtian Religion to be a *ſound Religion*, and yet charging it with *Idolatry*; So Dr. *St.* Contradicts himſelf, by affirming the *Roman Church* to be a *true Church*, and yet *Idolatrous*, as we have proved, and he now admits: and as it would doubtleſs be a ſufficient way of anſwering that *Jew*, to prove unto him, that the charge of Idolatry he laid upon

upon Christian Religion, was false, as contradicting a Principle true in it self, and assented unto by both parties: So the way we have taken to answer Dr. *St.* being the very same, must needs be sufficient: and finally the Quibbles Dr. *St.* makes at our manner of Answering are, or might be made, by the forementioned *Jew*, at the like manner of Answering him; and consequently they are insignificant in both Cases, or in neither.

Now to the Case proposed by Dr. *St.* my Answer is, That it would be a sufficient way to Answer that person of *Judah*, for those of *Israel* to prove to him, as they easily might, that if the Church of *Israel* was, in those times, a True Church, as they both affirmed, though erroneously, it was not Idolatrous: and that if it was not Idolatrous, what ever he alledged to prove it such, was void, and of no force. This, I say, would have been a sufficient way of Answering that person of *Judah*; but not others, who deny, as we do, the Church of *Israel* to have retained, in that time, the Essentials of a true Church: and it is no wonder, that what is a sufficient An-

swer

ſwer to one, be not a ſufficient Anſwer to another; Becauſe different Adverſaries go upon different Principles.

Let's now ſee, what Anſwer the Dr. makes to the Inſtance I produced, of a *Witneſs*, pag. 1. 14. who being once Convinced of *Self-Contradiction* in the evidence he alledges, renders himſelf unworthy to be heard any more in the Court; at leaſt till he has repaired his Reputation; and whatever he produces void and of no force: Beſides, the condign puniſhment he is liable unto. To this Dr. *St.* Anſwers, ingenuouſly confeſſing, as has been hinted above, *page 15. That Self contradiction, being proved, overthrows the Authority of the perſon, who ſtands convicted thereof*, and *where things depend meerly upon Authority*, it *is a good Argument*; *and nowhere elſe*. I willingly accept of what Dr. *St.* ſo liberally grants; and hence conclude, that if he contradicts himſelf, (as we both now ſuppoſe he does) all his Quotations, and all the Arguments he grounds upon them, (and he has ſcarce any Argument, which is not grounded upon ſome Quotation or other) ſignifie

 nothing,

nothing, becauſe they depend meerly upon his Authority; which, as he confeſſes, is overthrown by Self-contradiction: neither does he deſerve to be heard any more in matters that depend of Authority, till he has recruited his Credit. All this, according to Dr. *St.*'s own confeſſion, follows from Self-contradiction once proved againſt him. And though one may ſeek out the Teſtimonies he aledges in their proper fountains; at leaſt till then, and till one has found them to be faithfully quoted, (and who has examined all his Quotations?) he is not bound to give any credit unto them: and ſhould one take the pains to examin the Teſtimonies he aledges in their proper places, he would eaſily ſee, that they are either frivolous, or falſe; as the Learned Author of *Catholicks no Idolaters*, who was pleaſed to examin ſome of them, has already partly diſcovered.

Beſides no body in prudence can think himſelf bound to examin in their proper places, the allegations of one, who is evidently convicted of Self-contradiction: As for inſtance (to go on in

in the ſame ſimilitude of a Witneſs) ſhould one, before a judge, impeach another of High-Treaſon, and in proof thereof name the complices, and alledg, that there might be found in ſuch a place of his houſe, ſtore of Armes, and in his Cloſet Letters of ſecret Intelligence with Rebels, and Traitours; yet withal ſhould manifeſtly contradict himſelf, averring before the ſame Judge, and at the ſame time, that the perſon, whom he impeached of Treaſon, was, and had always been, a faithful Subject to his Majeſty: Can Dr. *St.* imagin in this caſe, that ſuch a judge would be bound, upon the meer Teſtimony of a Witneſs, who had ſo palpably Contradicted himſelf, to ſend Officers to Apprehend the Conſpiratours named by him, and to ſearch the houſe of the perſon impeached, to ſee whether what the Witneſs alledged, was true or not? or rather, that he ought not in prudence to look upon the Evidence of ſuch a Witneſs as null, and of no force; no leſs than if a Madman had put in the like accuſation. And yet ſuch a Witneſs might plead for himſelf in the ſame terms,

wherein Dr. *St.* pretends to vindicate his own proceedings.

For he might ſay, *That though he ſhould contradict himſelf, it does not therefore follow, (as certainly it does not) that all his Evidences are falſe, and whatever he ſhall hereafter ſay in the ſame matter, invalid. That he never was ſo vain, as to make uſe of his own authority, to prove a thing to be true, becauſe he believ'd it; or that his ſaying alone makes a thing to be true. That he does not deſire any one to follow his Opinion, becauſe it is his; but he offers evidences for proof of what he ſaies aſſigning the places, where they may find manifeſt Arguments of Treaſon. That if theſe be good, and true in themſelves, they do not therefore ceaſe to be ſo, becauſe they are inconſiſtent with what he ſaies in favour of the perſon he impeaches. That ſuch perſons, as are conſtituted by publick Authority, as all Judges are, to provide for the ſecurity of his Majeſties Royal Perſon, when they hear one impeached of High Treaſon, the Complices nominated, and the place aſſigned, where the Inſtruments of the conjuration may be found, ought not preſently to conclude, all theſe Allegations are falſe,*

and

and of no force, meerly becauſe the perſon who makes uſe of them, does judge ſo charitably of the Traitour, as to ſuppoſe, he ſtill retains the Eſſentials of a Faithful Subject; and that therefore they make very ill uſe of his Charity; but however, that they are more concern'd in proving the perſon he impeached, not guilty of Treaſon, than he is in defending his Charitable Opinion of him: That what they will get by charging him with Contradiction, is only, that hereafter he ſhall not think ſo Charitably of the perſons he impeaches. Finally, that when he ſaies, that ſuch a perſon, whom he impeaches, is a Traitour, but yet a faithful, and loyal Subject, the only true Conſequence, that thence may be inferred, is, not that he contradicts himſelf, but that he thinks, ſome kind of High-Treaſon to be conſiſtent with Loyalty; and that if they could prove to him, all ſorts of High Treaſon to be inconſiſtent with Loyalty, the Conſequence of it would be, that his Charity muſt be ſo much the leſs, but the danger would be the ſame.

Behold here the Vindication of the forementioned Witneſs, drawn up in the ſame terms, and upon the ſame

grounds, whereon Dr. *St.* in this Controverſie, builds his own Vindication. And yet what prudent man is there, that would not look upon the aforeſaid Vindication of a Witneſs, convicted of ſuch a manifeſt Self-contradiction, as frivolous and inſignificant? Yea, we have ſhewed already, upon another account, that on ſuppoſition he contradicts himſelf *in the way I inſiſt upon*, all his Arguments grounded either upon Authority, or meer Reaſon (if he has any ſuch) wherewith he pretends to make good the Charges caſt upon us, are falſe, or impertinent. The ſame is to be affirmed of whatever he ſhall hereafter object againſt our Church in matters of Faith; as long as he holds it to be a True Church. For nothing can be objected againſt our Church in that kind, which does not contradict the forementioned Principle.

Now 'tis very pretty to conſider, how the Dr. ſports with the forementioned inſtance of a Witneſs, whereof I made uſe; grounding all his quibbles upon ſo groſs an ignorance, as is to confound *Parities* with *identities*, and the being

being one thing like to another, with being the ſame: which Topick is very frequent in the Dr.'s Books. For, becauſe a Witneſs muſt make an *Affidavit* before the Maſters of the Chancery, he preſently fancies, that a Writer of Controverſies, ſuppoſing this parity to be good, muſt make an *Affidavit*, and no other Obligation will ſuffice him, before Maſters of the Court of Controverſies: and becauſe whatever is ſaid by a Witneſs at the Bar, is taken upon his Oath, he imagins, in the ſame ſuppoſition, that whatever a Writer of Controverſie ſaies, muſt be taken alſo upon his Oath, and in no other manner: and becauſe a Witneſs, who ſtands Convicted to have forſworn himſelf, according to the Laws of this Kingdom, is to be ſet in the Pillory, *p.* 27. with his Accuſation on his Forehead, he imagines himſelf, as being proved guilty of Self-contradiction, to be ſet in the Pillory, with this Accuſation on his forehead, *Dr. Stillingfleet againſt Dr. Stillingfleet*; not being able to conceive, that any other puniſhment can be inflicted upon one, who contradicts himſelf in mat-

ters of moment. Are not these Fancies of Dr. *St.* wonderfully witty? what fine Stuff will the Dr. make with Scripture, wherein Christ is compared to a Worm, to a Door, to a Lamb, to Lyon, and to several other things, infinitely below his Greatness, if he be permitted to use this manner of quibbling, and to make *identities*, of *parities*, or Parables.

Had not the Dr. made it his Study not to understand us, he might clearly have seen, that what we intended by the aforesaid instance was, that whoever stands convicted to have Contradicted himself most notoriously in matters of so great concern, as those of Religion are, deserves no credit should be given him in such matters, till he has recanted his Errour; which the Dr. himself does grant. I am not acquainted with the Stile of the *English* Church, nor of our Universities; yet I conceive, that there would be no absurdity, nor any thing done contrary to the practice of other Countries, and Universities, that Doctors of Divinity, and publick Preachers, should take their Oath, to Teach and

and Preach the Truth in matters of Religion: And in this Caſe, ſhould they palpably contradict themſelves, they would be guilty of Perjury. And though they do not take their Oaths, yet a natural Obligation lies upon every one, not to commit groſs Contradictions in matters of ſo high concern.

Some there are, who though they confeſs, that the way we have taken is ſufficient to confound our Adverſaries; yet becauſe they think we argue *ad hominem*, they do not look upon this way as effectual, to clear the *Roman* Church from the Aſperſions caſt upon her: For Arguments *ad hominem* are good to confound an Adverſarie, but not to evince the Truth.

To this I Anſwer, that an Argument *ad hominem*, properly ſpeaking, is, when one proceeds upon a Principle, which he judges to be falſe; yet becauſe it is granted by his Adverſary, he endeavours to confute him thereby. As for example, when a Catholick argues againſt a Proteſtant, out of ſuch Verſions of the Proteſtant Bible, which are falſe, and contrary to the Chatholick Bible,

Bible, to confute the particular Tenets of Proteſtancy: whence I conclude, that the way I made uſe of againſt Dr. *St.* was not properly *ad hominem*: For I proceeded upon a Principle, which I my ſelf, with all other *Roman-Catholicks*, and ſeveral others of different profeſſions, hold to be true; *viz. The Roman Church is a true Church*; and which is granted by Dr. *St.* Neither is it of any concern, that ſome deny the *Roman* Church to be a true Church; For if all Arguments are *ad hominem*, which are grounded upon ſome premiſe, that is denied by ſome, almoſt all Arguments are *ad hominem*. For what is there, that ſome do not deny? Should I have defeated all Dr. *St.*'s Objections out of plain Scripture, admitted both by him and us, no body could rationally have objected, that I did argue only *ad hominem*, or ſlight my proofs upon that account: and yet how many are there, that deny the very Scripture; which we, and Dr. *St.* agree upon!

To cloſe up therefore the firſt part of my Reply; By what hitherto has been laid down, it evidently appears, that

on

on ſuppoſition Dr. St. *contradicts himſelf in the way I inſiſt upon*, not only all the Charges, of Idolatry, Fanatiſciſme, danger of Salvation in our Communion, and Diviſions in matters of Faith, which he pretends to faſten upon our Church, fall to nothing; but alſo all the proofs, whether drawen from Authority, or Reaſon, wherewith he endeavours to make good ſuch Charges, are invalidated, and annull'd: which is all I did pretend in my Anſwer to the Dr. and whether this be not a ſufficient Anſwer to his Book, I leave to the judgment of any judicious man whatſoever. Yea the Dr. himſelf, being Conſcious (as it ſeems) how ill a cauſe he had, ſhould he grant himſelf guilty of Self-contradiction in matters of ſo great Concern; paſſing to the ſecond part of his pretended Anſwer, ſaies thus, *pag.* 17. *I had beſt ſtand upon my defence, and utterly deny that I have contradicted my ſelf in any thing, in which* J Ws. *has charged me.* And to paſs alſo unto the ſecond part of my Reply, let's now conſider, how he does vindicate himſelf from the Contradictions charged upon him.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

The Evaſions of the Dr. to clear himſelf from Self-contradiction, in Charging the Roman *Church with Idolatry; Examined.*

CONcerning the clearing himſelf from Contradiction, in imputing to the *Roman* Church Idolatry, and yet granting her to be a True Church, he ſaies, *pag.* 18. *That he never vindicated the Church of* Rome *from Idolatry*, in his Defence of Archbiſhop *Laud*; which is the Book, wherein he confeſſes the *Church of* Rome *to be a true Church.* But what does he mean by ſaying, *That he never vindicated the Church of* Rome *from Idolatry?* does he mean, that he never writ any Treatiſe on this Subject? That I confeſs to be true. But ſure, to commit Contradiction 'tis not neceſſary to have written Treatiſes in vindication of each, or either part of the Contradiction. Had he ſaid in expreſs terms, *The Church of* Rome *is a true Church,*

and

and is not a true Church, would he not have Contradicted himſelf, unleſs he had publiſhed Books, or Treatiſes, in defence of the one or the other part of ſuch a palpable Contradiction, as this? To Contradict ones ſelf 'tis enough to affirm, and to deny the ſame thing, although he has never writ, or produced Arguments to prove the one or the other part. Does he therefore mean, that in defence of Archbiſhop *Lawd*, he has not laid down any Principle, nor aſſerted any thing; which, if true, does not clear the Church of *Rome* from Idolatry: and conſequently contradicts the Charg he laies upon her, in his Diſcourſe of Idolatry? This I have ſhewn to be falſe; becauſe in the Defence of Archbiſhop *Lawd*, he grants *the Church of* Rome *to be a true Church*: which conceſſion does evidently clear her from Idolatry, wherewith he charges her in his other Book: neither has he yet vindicated himſelf from this Contradiction; as we ſhall ſee by examining the ſhifts, whereby he pretends to clear himſelf, *pag.* 18.

He adds in the ſame place, that it fell out very happily, that in his Defence of Arch-

Archbiſhop *Lawd*, *pag.* 596. 606. he had made a Diſcourſe to the ſame purpoſe, proving the Church of *Rome* guilty of Idolatry, in the Invocation of Saints, and the Worſhip of Images. But what does this help to ſhew, that what he ſaies in his Defence of Archbiſhop *Lawd* does not contradict what he Aſſerts in his Diſcourſe of Idolatry; which is his main deſign in the preſent Anſwer? Is not this, as if one ſhould have affirmed, what Dr. *St. ſaies in one part of his Defenſe of the Archbiſhop, does contradict what he ſaies in another part of the ſame Book. Therefore what he ſaies in his Defence of the Archbiſhop, does not contradict what he aſſerts in his Diſcourſe of Idolatry?* Is not Dr. *St.* like to have a good cauſe, if ſuch Inferences as theſe be warrantable. To contradict himſelf in the very ſelf ſame Book is more deteſtable, and can be no medium to prove, that he does not contradict himſelf in different Books. Neither was I ignorant of the forementioned contradiction, committed by him in his former Book: but becauſe my Deſign in *Dr. Stillingfleet againſt Dr. Stillingfleet* was,

to

to annul the Charges laid upon the *Roman* Church in his Diſcourſe of Idolatry, I took notice only of the Contradiction betwen his former Book and latter Diſcourſe; never intending to deny, that in the ſame book he did contradict himſelf. For the Dr. does ſo ſtuff up his works with Contradictions, that it is not neceſſary to turn over many Books, nay nor many Chapters, nor (ſometimes) many leaves, to meet with them.

He ſaies farther in the ſame page 18. that I do not pretend to gather out of his Books *any Contradiction in Terms*, or a *Formal Affirmation and Negation of the ſame Object*; but only *by Conſequence*: and I deſire to know of him, whether, if I do ſhew, as I have already ſhewn, That what he aſſerts in his *Rational Account*, does by good Conſequence contradict, and annul the Charges laid upon us in his *Diſcourſe of Idolatry*; All thoſe Inferences mentioned above, which follow from Self-contradiction *in the way I inſiſt upon*, do not by good conſequence fall heavy upon him? and if ſo, whether this be not enough to confute him?

To

To declare the better the inanity of these Evasions he makes use of, to Vindicate himself from Contradictions; let us put case, that one, who heretofore had confest Dr. *St.* to be an Honest man; should now, upon some pick, although retaining yet the former good opinion of his honesty, affirm him to be a Knave; and that some of the Dr.'s Friends, to vindicate him from so foul an Aspersion, should charge his Adversary, as justly they might, with Contradiction, in affirming Dr. *St.* to be an Honest man, and yet a Knave; can he, or any one else, imagin, that such a man would sufficiently clear himself from the Crime of Contradiction, by saying, *That he never vindicated the Honesty of Dr.* St. *although he has heretofore, and did still, hold him to be an Honest man*; *That it had happily fallen out, that when heretofore he acknowledged him to be an honest man, even at the same time he had published him for a Knave*; *and finally, that to say he is an Honest man, and yet a Knave, is no* Formal Contradiction *in* terms,; *since he does not* Formally *say that he is, and is not, an Honest man*; *or affirm,*

affirm, and deny the ſame thing? This Caſe is parallel to the Vindication Dr. *St.* makes here for himſelf; and ſo clear, that any one, without difficulty, may make the Application: And yet there is no more Contradiction in affirming that one is an Honeſt man, and yet a Knave, than in ſaying, That the ſame Church is a True Church, and yet Idolatrous: and the Contradiction in both Caſes is ſo palpable, that it appears to any one, who underſtands what he ſaies, without needing to draw it out by Conſequences.

In the next page, in order to the farther clearing himſelf from Self-contradiction, *pag.* 19. he carges me with Diſingenuity; becauſe (forſooth) as he ſaies, *I barely oppoſe a judgment of Charity concerning our Church*, (ſuch he ſtiles this Conceſſion of his, *The Roman Church is a true Church*) to *a judgment of Reaſon concerning the nature of Actions*: and ſuch he will needs have this his Aſſertion to be, *The Roman Church is an Idolatrous Church.* Is not this a pretty way to ſave all Contradictions, let them be never ſo palpable? For, in all Contradictions the

one part is favourable; which upon thaat ccount may be called a Judgment of Charity, or Kindneſs; and conſequently, according to this excellent Principle of Dr. *St.* cannot without Diſingenuity, be put in oppoſition to the other part, which is grounded, or pretended to be grounded, upon other reſpects; for both parts of a Contradiction cannot have the ſame enducements. Suppoſe, that Dr. *St.* had expreſsly granted *The Roman Church to be, and not to be an Idolatrous Church*; (which, ſure, is to grant palpable Contradictions, if it is poſſible, that there ſhould be any ſuch) would the Dr. in this Caſe think it a ſatisfactory Anſwer to ſay, That the one of theſe Judgments is of Charity, and the other of Reaſon? and that accordingly, one cannot be oppoſite to the other? and to urge the inſtance produced above, ſhould one be charged with Self-contradiction, for aſſerting Dr. *St.* to be an Honeſt man, and yet a Knave, certainly no prudent perſon can think, that ſuch a one would ſufficiently clear himſelf by ſaying, That he granted him to be an Honeſt man out of meer kind-

kindneſs, but that he affirmed him to be a Knave upon good and ſolid Reaſon: and that therefore no body could, without diſingenuity oppoſe the one Judgment againſt the other. Theſe pittiful ſhifts of Dr. *St.* make one exclaim, *O how unhappy a thing it is to engage in a bad Cauſe! What will not ſome ſay, rather than unſay themſelves, and confeſs their Errours!*

Again, either Dr. *St.* thinks this Conceſſion of his, *The Roman Church is a true Church*, to be grounded upon good, and ſolid Reaſon, as really it is, or he does not think it ſuch: now if he think it ſuch, it is not a Judgement of Charity only, but of Reaſon alſo; and conſequently, he unjuſtly charges me with diſingenuity, for oppoſing a Judgment of meer Charity againſt a Judgment of Reaſon; ſince both, in his opinion, are Judgments of Reaſon. If he does not think this his Conceſſion to be grounded upon Reaſon, how can it be a Judgment of true, and real Charity? Can it be true Charity to tell us, That we are in a true way to Salvation, That our Church does not

teach us any damnable Errour, or any thing destructive to our Eternal Welfare; and yet to tell us all this, without any Reason to think it so? Such a Charity of this, if it must be called so, is rather a meer Cheat, than Charity. Nay, since the Dr. has declared himself an implacable Enemy to the *Roman* Church, bespattering her with so many foul Aspersions, 'tis not credible, he would grant her to be a True Church, did not good, and solid Reasons force him thereunto: and we have seen above, that the very same grounds, whereby he pretends to establish the Truth of the Protestant Church, evince also the Truth of the *Roman* Church. So that he must either confess, That he grants his own Church to be true out of meer Charity, without any solid ground for to grant it; or he must acknowledge our Church to be a true Church upon good, and solid Reasons, at least in his Opinion.

And because Dr. *St.* and his Associates do so often vapour of their Charity, in allowing *Roman-Catholicks* a possibility of Salvation; endeavouring (some of

of them) thence to prove, That their Religion is better than ours, which does not allow ſo much to Proteſtants, 'twill not be amiſs, to examin the depth of this their Charity: and ſure, if we conſider, how thoſe, who deny our Church to be a true Church, are puzzled, and to what ſhifts they are put, concerning the continuation of the True Church for ſo many years before *Luther*, and *Calvin*; their Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction, and ſeveral other points of higheſt concern, objected againſt them; we may prudently believe, that when they acknowledge our Church to be a true Church, they do it not ſo much out of any kindneſs they have for us; as for their own proper Intereſt, and Concern.

Again, if that Religion has the greateſt Charity, and upon that account is to be held for the beſt Religion, that makes the way of Salvation wideſt, the Religion of the *Libertines*, and *Latitudinarians*, who affirm all Religions to be true, and ſufficient to Salvation, whether *Chriſtianiſm*, *Judaiſm*, *Paganiſm*, or *Mahometiſm*, would be the beſt of all Religions: which certainly Dr. *St.* will

never grant, although he burns with ſo great Charity. Moreover, leaving both parties, Catholicks and Proteſtants, to their proper Tenets, 'tis greater Charity in Catholicks towards Proteſtants, to tell them they are in the wrong, than in Proteſtants towards Catholicks, to tell them they are in the right, or in a true way to Salvation. For the moſt that Proteſtants can effect in Catholicks with this their Conceſſion, is to encourage them to go on with more alacrity in the way, wherein they are; ſince they ſee, that even their greateſt Enemies do grant them to be in a true way to Heaven: when as Catholicks, by telling Proteſtants they are in the wrong, may bring many of them to the right, and ſave them from Damnation: Since they cannot but be much moved, ſeeing that ſo many Learned men, who are ten to one for Proteſtants, do affirm with ſo great aſſeveration, and conſtancy, producing ſeveral ſolid grounds, in proof of what they affirm, *That Proteſtants are in the wrong way.* And beyond debate it is far greater Charity to ſave one from Damnation, than only to encourage him

him to obtain his Salvation: So it is greater Charity to tell one, whom we know to be out of the way, That he is in the wrong; than to tell one, whom we know to be in the true way, That he is in the right: Becauſe the one, unleſs he be told of his Errour, will probably go on, and never come whither he intended: when as the other, encouraged by our advice, will only come ſooner to his journey's end: whither he would have arrived, although we had told him nothing.

Beſides, when our Adverſaries are pinched with the inferences we deduce from this their Conceſſion, they do ſo mince, and clip their Charity, that it ſcarce retains any ſhew or mark thereof, as appears by what Archbiſhop *Lawd*, Dr. *Stillingfleet*, and others, aſſert in this matter. For they ſay, That all Learned men among us are damned, if they continue in Communion with the *Roman* Church: Nay the ſame they affirm of all thoſe, who underſtand the pretended Abſurdities, they are pleaſed to oppoſe againſt us: which in their opinion are ſo clear, and manifeſt, that no

body, who is not a meer Fool, or a Madman, and consequently in a condition not capable of Malice, may easily understand them: That scarce any one is saved amongst us; That only an invincible ignorance, which is not easily presumed in matters so clear, (as they will needs have our Errours to be, and wherein every one is so much concern'd) can excuse us from eternal Damnation: That we are all flat Idolaters, and as gross, as the grossest of the Heathen; and by consequence, That this Proposition, *A Roman-Catholick may be saved*, hath no more truth in it than this, *An Idolater may be saved*: Finally, that *Roman-Catholicks* may be saved upon condition they repent of their Errours; as also *Jews*, *Turks*, and *Pagans* may be saved upon the like Condition.

Now if we compare with these their Assertions concerning *Roman Catholicks*, what we affirm of Protestants, in order to their Salvation or Damnation, we shall evidently see, that there is little or no difference between us and them in relation to this point; and that they have no cause to make such Bravado's of

of their Charity towards us. For between theſe two Propoſitions, ſcarce any one is ſaved, and all are damned, there is ſo ſcant a difference, that there is very little reaſon to boaſt thereof. Neither do we deny, but that ſome Proteſtants have an invincible ignorance of the Errours of their Religion; and conſequently upon that account are no leſs excuſable from Damnation, than they ſay we are. Beſides, Catholicks do not affirm, That thoſe Proteſtants, who are in a condition not capable of Malice, as meer Fools, Madmen, and Children, are more liable to damnation, than Catholicks of the ſame condition: Yet farther, we never aſſert that this Propoſition Proteſtants are damned, has more truth in it, than this, Idolaters are damned: and conſequently it is as true, That a Proteſtant may be ſaved, as that an Idolater may be ſaved. Neither do we deny, but Proteſtants may be ſaved if they repent. Where then is the difference between their Charity and ours, that may give them any cauſe of Vapouring?

In Fine, if things be well conſidered,

it

it will manifeſtly appeare, That Proteſtants damn more Catholicks, than Catholicks do Proteſtants. For it is certain, that there are at leaſt twenty Roman-Catholicks in the world for one Proteſtant of the *Engliſh* Church; with which is our preſent debate. Now ſince they affirm, that ſcarce any Catholick is ſaved, let's put the caſe, that only one in twenty is ſaved, and all the reſt are damned; according to this computation, they damn nineteen, where we damn one; Suppoſing that we damn all Proteſtants, or believe them to be damned, if they continue in that Profeſſion; and they ſcarce ſave any Chatholick, or believe him to be ſaved, if he lives and dies in the Communion of the *Roman* Church. So that concerning the Damnation, or Salvation of Contrary Party, we have more reaſon to glory of our Charity, than they. And hence evidently appears the inanity of their pretended Charity, which they often caſt in our Teeth; this being a common Topick, whence they have framed many Sermons, and Diſcourſes againſt us.

Yet

Yet I cannot deny, but that the Charity of Dr. *St.* is enhanced to a high degree: For he has made the bounds of the True Church so wide, that it contains not only the most notorious Hereticks, but also the greatest Idolaters. Was it not therefore very ill done of me, to make so bad a use of so wonderful a Charity? And all this he does out of his exceeding great kindness for Protestant Religion; and because he cannot find a way, how to bring her within the verge of the True Church, without letting in with her the grossest Idolaters of the world, both in Doctrine and Practice. But whether Protestants will think themselves bound to render the Dr. Thanks for his excess of his Charity, I leave it to the judgment of the Learned, and Zealous men amongst them. One step only is wanting, to make this Charity perfect indeed; and that is, to enlarge the Pale of the True Church so far, as that it may take in flat Atheists: which he may do with as much ease, as he does other things.

In the *pages* 19, 20, 21, 22. he mingles many things, which do not tend to prove

prove, that he does not contradict himſelf, (which was the proper ſubject in this ſecond part of his Anſwer) but only, that on ſvppoſition he ſhould contradict himſelf in the way I inſiſt upon, yet this would not be a ſatisfactory anſwer, nor annull the Reaſons he produced in order to make good the charges he laies againſt us: All which has been already anſwered above in the firſt part of our Reply. As concerning his Vindication from Self-contradiction, he ſaies, *pag.* 20, 21 That by granting us a True Church, and yet charging us with Idolatry, it does not follow, That he contradicts himſelf, but the only true conſequence is, That he thinks ſome kind of Idolatry conſiſtent with the Being of a True Church. For *what ſhadow of Contradiction is it* (they are the Dr.'s words *pag.* 21.) *to ſay, That the Roman Church is a true Church, and yet is guilty of Idolatry, ſuppoſing he believes ſome ſort of Idolatry, which is very ſinful, not to be yet of ſo high a nature, as to unchurch thoſe that practiſe it.* A ſtrange Anſwer! ſo that if one has ſo good an opinion of himſelf, (and who has not?) as to believe, or think,

think, that what he affirms is, in ſome ſort, conſiſtent with what he denies, let him affirm or deny what he pleaſes, according to this admirable evaſion of *Dr. Stillingfleet*, he will be free from Self-contradiction: Whoever joynes two terms, that really contradict one another, whatever he thinks, he commits a Contradiction. Should one affirm another to be a notorious Traitor, but yet a Loyal Subject, (which is the inſtance above inſinuated) could the Dr. prudently ſay in this caſe, that ſuch a perſon did not contradict himſelf, but that the only true conſequence, that hence might be inferred, was, That he thought ſome ſort of notorious Treaſon to be conſiſtent with Loyalty? or could he juſtly exclaim, *What ſhadow of Contradiction is it to ſay, That one is a notorious Traitor, but yet a Loyal Subject*; ſuppoſing that who ſaies this, believes ſome ſort of Treaſon, though very notorious, not to be yet of ſo high a nature, as to deſtroy Loyalty?

Neither ſhould the Dr. have ſuppoſed *pag.* 22. (as he does) but proved, that the Idolatry introduced by *Jeroboam* among

mong the *Iſraelites*, was not deſtructive to the being of a True Church. Several Proteſtants, among other precedents, prōduce the Church of *Iſrael*, infected with the Idolatry of *Jeroboam* to ſhew, that the true viſible Church may ceaſe: and conſequently, they believed the Church of *Iſrael* to have ceaſed to be a true Church, by reaſon of the Idolatry ſhe committed; otherwiſe they could never have made uſe of the ſaid inſtance to that intent: and accordingly they look't upon that Idolatry, as deſtructive to the Being of a True Church. For how can a Church ceaſe to be true, upon the account of an Idolatry, not deſtructive to the Being of a True Church? Yea the Apoſtle, *Rom.* 11. does, not obſcurely, inſinuate, that the Idolatry practiſed by the *Iſraelites* did unchurch them; yet they were not all infected therewith. For God told *Elias*, when he complained, that *he was left alone in Iſrael, that ſeven thouſand of them had not bowed their knees unto Baal.*

The Evaſions produced hitherto by the Dr. are, as we have ſeen, ineffectual to clear him from Self-contradiction; and

and ſuch as, had they any force in them, would prove it impoſſible, that any one ſhould contradict himſelf; eſpecially, if he believed he does not; which is evidently falſe. So that the Dr. to ſhew himſelf guiltleſs of Self-contradiction, takes the ſame way, as if to prove himſelf an honeſt man, he ſhould alledge no better Reaſons, than ſuch as prove, (if they prove any thing) that there have never been, nor are, any Knaves in the world; but that all are, and have been, honeſt men. But this is a common Artifice of Dr. *St.* So that he may produce ſany Arguments that ſeem to prove his intent, he cares not whatever elſe they prove with the ſame force; and ſo he may ſhoot home, he matters not, how much he over ſhoots himſelf: though one may miſs as much of the mark by being gone, as by being ſhort. And although the Dr. has been adviſed of the Nullity of this manner of Arguing, according to that Maxime, an *Argument that proves too much, proves nothing*, yet hitherto he has not thought it for his purpoſe to take notice of it.

In the ſame *page* 22. the Dr. affirms, that

that *although they do allow the Church of* Rome *to be a true Church, they are far from understanding by that a Sound, or a good Church*: but mean no more by it, than as a man is a true man, though he hath the Plague upon him. Neither did I ever say, (*Dr. St. ag. Dr. St. pag* 3.) that Dr. *St.* expresly affirmed, that our Church is a *Sound Church*, but only that he granted it to be a *True Church*: which neither now does he deny, or question. For, among other things, I alledged out of the Dr. in order to this purpose, I affirmed, that he held our Church *to be a true way to Heaven*, but not a *safe way*; which signifies here the same, as a *true* Church, but not a *sound* Church. Now Dr. *St.* does plainly confess, that it is a Contradiction to say, That the *Roman* Church is a *Sound* Church, and yet an *Idolatrous* Church: which (*viz.* had he granted our Church to be *Sound*) *would be* as he saies, *p.* 23. *the most proper sense to found a Contradiction upon, in this matter of Idolatry.* For he freely grants, that all sorts of Idolatry are inconsistent with the *Soundness* of a Church; but not with the *Truth* thereof.

Where-

Wherefore, if I can evince, That all ſorts of Idolatry are at leaſt that ſort of Idolatry, which he faſtens upon *Roman-Catholicks*, is deſtructive, not only to the *Soundneſs*, but alſo to the *Truth* of a Church; and that an Idolatrous Church is not as a man ſick of the Plague, who may retain the Eſſentials of a man: if (I ſay) I can evince this, it will be a contradiction, not only to ſay, That the *Roman* Church is a *Sound* Church, and yet an *Idolatrous*; but alſo to affirm, That the *Roman* Church is a *True* Church, and yet *Idolatrous*; at leaſt with ſuch a kind of Idolatry, as Dr. *St.* laies upon her: for which ſee.

CHAP. V.

The Doctor palpably Contradicts himself in affirming the Roman *Church to be Idolatrous, and yet granting her to be a True Church.*

WHen my Book first appeared in publick, several Zealous Protestants, who had been pleased to peruse it, were so firmly perswaded, that there is a palpable Contradiction between these two Propositions, *The Roman Church is a True Church*, *The Roman Church is an Idolatrous Church*; and being moreover sensible, what an affront it is for any one especially for Lerned men, to grant, and persist to grant palpable Contradictions, they would never believe, that Dr. *St.* whom they ~~applauded so much for his Learning,~~ had ever granted the two forementioned Propositions. Besides, they being not able to deny, but that he asserted *The Roman Church to be an Idolatrous Church*, seeing he had written a whole Tractise of

that Subject, they concluded, that he had never granted *The Roman Church to be a True Church*, although I quoted out of him ſeveral plain places to that intent.

But now Dr. *St.* has done me juſtice, and has cleared all doubts, if any might be in this matter; ingenuouſly confeſſing, that he has heretofore, and does ſtill affirm *The Roman Church to be a true Church*. And why ſhould he plainly confeſs, that he had affirmed any ſuch thing, ſo diſadvantagious unto him, were it not ſo manifeſt he had done ſo, that it could not be queſtioned? eſpecially, when he is forced to winde himſelf all the waies he can to diſentangle the contradiction objected againſt him: whereas had he never granted *the Roman Church to be a true Church*, all appearance of Self contradiction in this point would have vaniſhed.

Nay, he confirms clearly the ſame Doctrine in ſeveral places of this his Examination of my Book. For *pag.* 21. he ſaies thus; *We acknowledg that they* (Roman Catholicks) *ſtill retain the Fundamental Articles of the Chriſtian Faith; That there is no diſpute between them and*

us about the True God, and his Son, Jesus Christ, as to his Death, Resurrection, and Glory, and being the proper Object of Divine Worship. We yeild, that they have true Baptism among them, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: and we looking upon these, as the Essentials of a true Church, do upon that account own that Church to be so. Where, without doubt he judges the points here mentioned to be all the Fundamental and Essential points of a true Church: otherwise he would not own our Church to be a true Church precisely, because she holds the forementioned points. For a Church that fails but in one Essential point of a true Church, although it be the least of all, is no true Church.

[And here by the way I cannot but Advertise, that Dr. *St.* without (perhaps) reflecting on it, has set down a particular Catalogue of all the Fundamental points of the True Religion: which protestants commonly are loth to do.]

Page 23. he saies, *Those which we account the Essentials of a Church, we deny not to it*, that is, to the Church of *Rome*:

and

and a Church, that retains all the *Eſſentials* of a true Church, muſt needs be ſo. In the ſame place he compares our Church, over-run, as he ſaies, *with ſuch Corruptions in Worſhip*, to a man that has the Plague upon him; who yet ſtill remains a true man. *Pag.* 22. *when we allow* (ſaies he) *the Church of Rome to be a True Church, we are far from underſtanding by that a ſound, or good Church*: which words expreſsly ſignifie, that he and his Partizans allow our Church to be a True Church: which is all we now pretend. But more at large he confirms this Doctrine, *pag.* 29. §. 4. where he has in the Margin theſe words, *In what ſenſe the Church of Rome is owned by him, and other Proteſtants as a true Church*: which manifeſtly imports, that they own her as ſuch. *Pag.* 30. he ſpeaks thus, *Whatever Church owns thoſe things, which are Antecedently neceſſary to the Being of a Church, cannot ſo long ceaſe to be a true Church*: and in the ſame page, immediately before, he inſinuates, that thoſe things only are neceſſary Antecedently to the Being of a Church, which are required to be believed in order to Salva-

tion: and *pag.* 31. he saies, *Nothing ought to be owned as necessary to Salvation by Christian Societies, but such things which by all those Societies* (*i. e.* Christian Societies, and consequently by the *Roman* Church, who is one of them) *are abknowledged antecedently necessary to the Being of the Catholick Church. pag.* 32. he makes (and confessed he made before) *the Ancient Creeds of the Catholick Church the best measure of those things which are believed to be necessary to Salvation:* and consequently were sufficient to constitute the Essence, and Being of a True Church. Now 'tis evident, neither doth Dr. *St.* ever question it, but rather very often supposes it, That the *Roman* Church doth embrace *the Ancient Creeds of the Catholick Church*, wherefore even according to Dr. *St.*'s constitution of a true Church, the Church of *Rome* is necessarily such. *Pag.* 26. he saies *We have no Controversie with them* (Catholicks) *about the Essential Doctrines of Religion, which is that we mean by their being a True Church.* Finally, *pag.* 33. and in other places the Dr. distinguishes between the Essence and Sound-

oundneſs of a Church, and he ſeveral times grants, that *our Church holds all that is requiſite to the Eſſence of a True Church*: But he denies, that ſhe holds all that is neceſſary to the *Soundneſs* of a Church: Neither did I ever alledge Dr. *St.* to the contrary; as above I inſinuated.

Hence is evidently concluded, that it is the unqueſtionable Sentiment of Dr. *St.* that the *Roman* Church, even as it is now in the world, is a True Church, retaining all the *Eſſential*, and *Fundamental* Points of Chriſtian Faith: All which I have ſayed, not becauſe Dr. *St.* did ever deny it; but becauſe ſome of his Friends could ſcarce believe that he, who had endeavoured with all his ſtrength, to prove the Church of *Rome* guilty of Idolatry, ſhould notwithſtanding hold her to be a *True Church*. See more concerning this in his Anſwer to my Book, *pag.* 40, 41, 42. Wherefore ſince it cannot be queſtioned but that Dr. *St.* has heretofore, and does ſtill allow theſe two Propoſitions, *The Roman Church is a True Church*, *The Roman Church is an Idolatrous Church*,

we come now to examin, whether the latter Proposition contradicts the former? which Dr. *St.* denies; but we do prove in the following Discourse.

If the *Roman* Church holds any Fundamental, or Essential Errour in matters of Faith, it is no True Church. For it is certain, that some Errours are sufficient to unchurch a Community, and destructive to the very Being of a True Church: otherwise a Congregation that holds there is no God, might yet be a True Church: and if any Errours be such, sure such are all Fundamental, and Essential Errours. For all Errours in matters of Faith, even according to Dr. *St.* and other Protestant Divines, are divided into Fundamental or Essential, and into Non-fundamental, or Non-essential. These latter they affirm to be consistent with the Essence, and Being of a True Church; but not with the Soundness thereof: But the former are destructive, not only to the Soundness, but also to very Essence of a True Church. So that whoever saies, that such a Church is a True Church, but yet that she holds some Fundamental Errours, he com-

mits

mits a manifeſt Contradiction, as if he ſhould ſay, ſuch a Church is, and is not True. Upon this account thoſe Proteſtants, who grant the *Roman* Church to be a True Church, but yet depraved with ſeveral Errours, to ſave themſelves from Self-contradiction, commonly affirm, that the Errours of the *Roman* Church are not Fundamental, nor Eſſential, but only inferiour Errours, Non-fundamental, and Non-eſſential.

Again, if the *Roman* Church holds any Errour, neceſſarily deſtructive to any Fundamental, or Eſſential Point of Faith, ſhe muſt needs hold a Fundamental, and Eſſential Errour in matters of Faith. This is alſo evident; neither can Dr. *St.* deny it. For an Errour is denominated Fundamental, or Non-fundamental; Eſſential, or Non eſſential, from the nature and quality of the Truth, wherewith it is inconſiſtent: all Errour being inconſiſtent with ſome Truth. So that if the Truth, or any of the Truths, wherewith ſuch an Errour is inconſiſtent, be Fundamental or, Eſſential, the Errour muſt needs be Fundamental, or Eſſential: But if none of them be Fundamental,

damental, neither can the Error be Fundamental. Now the inconsistency of a Proposition with its contradictory, or of an Errour with the Truth opposite thereunto, does not consist, in that an Errour does absolutely destroy the Truth in it self, wherewith it is said to be inconsistent: For it is certain this Erroneous Judgment, *There is no God*, does not destroy the Truth of its Contradictory, *There is a God*: nor in that he, who gives an assent to the one part, cannot possibly at the same time give his assent to the contrary part; otherwise it would not be possible for any one to Contradict himself; which is manifestly false, as Dr. *St.* himself does too too well know. The forementioned inconsistency therefore consists in the repugnancy, in order to the Truth of both Propositions together, and at the same time; or in that the Truth of the one necessarily destroyes the Truth of the other: So that if the Errour, which is inconsistent with a Fundamental Truth, should cease to be an Errour, the contrary Truth would cease to be a Truth.

Moreover some Errours are not de-

structive

ſtructive to any Fundamental Point, immediately, or formally, or in expreſs terms, as this Error, *There is no God*, is deſtructive to this Fundamental point, *There is a God*; but only mediately, and by Conſequences; becauſe they deſtroy immediately ſomething, wherewith ſome Fundamental point is neceſſarily connexed; which being once deſtroyed, ſuch a Fundamental point muſt neceſſarily fall: as, ſuppoſing that it is a Fundamental point of Chriſtian Faith, that *Chriſt is God, Conſubſtantial to his Father*, this Errour, *Chriſt is a meer Creature*, is beyond debate Fundamental; although it does not deſtroy immediately the former Truth, but only mediately, and by Conſequence, becauſe it immediately deſtroyes its Contradictory, *viz. Chriſt is not a meer Creature*; which being deſtroyed, the former Fundamental Truth does neceſſarily fall. For, whatſoever is God, either is *no Creature*, or at leaſt *no meer Creature*. Wherefore 'tis a Fundamental Errour, whatſoever neceſſarily deſtroyes a Fundamental Truth, whether mediately or immediately. For the malice and malignity

lignity of a Fundamental Errour consists in its Destructiveness to a Fundamental point: and what destroyes it mediately, does truly destroy it; but destroies with it some other thing. One may beat down a Steeple, either by shooting immediately at the Steeple, or at the Tower that upholds the Steeple; and in both Cases the Steeple is equally beaten down; but with this difference; that in the second case the Tower also is beaten down with the Steeple. Yea, Dr. *St.* himself *pag.* 24. confesses, the second way of Worship, mentioned there by him, to be destructive mediately only, and by Consequence, *to the Existency of a true God*; and yet it is inconsistent, doubtless, with the *Being of a true Church*: since by such a Worship, *the Unity of the Godhead* is denyed, and many False Gods are joyned with him in the same Worship; and to teach a multiplicity of Gods, is beyond debate, to teach an Errour, by reason of its opposition to the *Unity of the Godhead*, destructive to *the Being* of a Church.

Besides, I said, that an Errour, which is necessarily destructive to any Fun-

Fundamental point, whatſoever it be, muſt needs be Fundamental, and inconſiſtent with the Eſſence of a True Church. For an Errour, as other Negations, is *malignantis naturæ*, of a malignant nature; ſuch as deſtroying any *Eſſential* part, or intrinſical condition, muſt needs deſtroy the whole. So that a Church, *to be True*, muſt have all her Eſſentials; but, to be abſolutely Falſe, 'tis enough, that any one of them be wanting, according to thoſe common Axioms of Philoſophers, *Bonum ex integra cauſa; malum autem ex quolibet defectu.* Death deſtroies the Eſſence of a man; and yet it neither deſtroies the Soul, nor the Body immediately; but only the Union between them both: which is the leaſt conſiderable thing in a mans Eſſence.

Finally, becauſe we diſcourſe now, what Errours are Eſſential in matters of Faith, and inconſiſtent with the Being of a True Church, we muſt reflect, that according to Divines, there are two ſorts of Errours; the one Privative, the other Poſitive. A Church does err privatively againſt the Eſſence of a True Church, by

by not holding all the positive Essential points requisite thereunto, (although she should not positively hold any thing contrary to such points;) A Congregation of Men, who should not believe there is a God, although they should not positively believe that there is no God, would, beyond all question, be no *true Church*. But a Church errs positively against the Essence of a true Church, when she positively holds, and asserts something inconsistent with an Essential point, whatever else she affirms. Doubtless a Church, or Congregation, which teaches *that there is no God*, cannot be a true Church, whatever else she teaches. Both these sorts of Errours are destructive to the Essence of a Church: and the latter is rather worse than the former. For it is worse *to believe that there is no God*, than *not to believe that there is a God*. Hence I infer, that to the constitution of a true Church 'tis not enough to assert, the positive Articles requisite to the Being of a Church; but 'tis also necessary, not to hold any Errour, inconsistent with any of such Articles; as it happens to several

ral persons, who deny; either mediately or immediately, those very points which they confess.

These things being premised, I go on to shew, that if the *Roman* Church does hold any kind of Idolatry, (what kind soever it be) to be lawful, as Dr. *St.* expressly affirms she does, she must needs hold an Errour destructive a to Fundamental, and Essential point of Faith; and by consequence, a Fundamental Errour, inconsistent with the Essence of a true Church. And since 'tis certain, that no kind of Idolatry is lawful, if the *Roman* Church holds any kind of Idolatry as lawful, she must needs hold an Errour inconsistent with some Truth, as all Errour is. Now it is not possible, that the *Roman* Church should hold any sort of Idolatry whatsoever, as lawful, unless she holds that *some Honour, which is due only to God, may be given to a meer Creature.* For the notion of Idolatry in general does necessarily contain this, even as Dr. *St.* himself confesses, in this Book, *pag.* 24. where he saies thus, *I agree in general, that the true notion of Idolatry is, giving the*

the Honour due only to God, to a meer Creature; but he adds presently these words, *I desire no greater advantage against the Church of Rome, in order to prove her Idolatrous, than from such a Concession*: which is as much as if I should say, *I desire no greater advantage against Dr.* St. *in order to prove him a Knave, than that he should grant, as doubtless he does, that the Notion of a Knave in general, is he, who makes it his business to cheat others*: For I am certain, that it is far easier to shew, that this notion of a Knave does agree to Dr. *St.* than that notion of Idolatry to the *Roman* Church.

But for my present purpose it is enough, that Dr *St.* grants that to be the true notion of Idolatry in general. For so 'tis evident, that let the kinds of Idolatry be never so many, they must needs participate the forementioned notion; because all the Species, or different kinds, must needs participate the general notion, under which they are contained: as for instance, because it is the general notion of an Animal, to be *vivens sensibile*, a living Substance endowed with a sensitive power, let the Species,

or

or differences be never ſo many, 'tis impoſſible, that there ſhould be any ſort of Animal, which is not *vivens ſenſibile*. So that, whatſoever is not *vivens ſenſibile*, is not *Animal*: and whatſoever Worſhip is ſuch, that thereby *the Honor due only to God, is not given to a meer Creature*, ſuch a worſhip cannot be any ſort of Idolatry.

Hence I infer, that 'tis impoſſible the *Roman* Church ſhould teach, or hold, any kind of Idolatry whatſoever it be, *groſs*, or *not groſs*, but ſhe muſt hold, (ſuppoſing the Notion of Idolatry in general, to be ſuch as has been inſinuated) expreſsly or impſicitly, in the ſame manner as ſhe holds Idolatry, *That ſome Honour due only to God may be given to a meer Creature*: which Errour (for evidently 'tis an Errour) is inconſiſtent with the contrary Truth, *viz. No Honour due to God may be given to a meer Creature*. And what Truth is this? Fundamental and Eſſential, or Non-fundamental and Non-eſſential? without debate it is a Fundamental, and Eſſential point of Religion. For what point is ſuch, if this be not? Nay, Dr. *St.* himſelf does abſolutely grant it, *pag.* 26. in the Anſwer to my firſt Propoſition

ſition, as hereafter will appear; and *p.* 21. he accounts among the Eſſentials of a true Church, and the Fundamental Articles of the Chriſtian Faith, this very propoſition, *viz. That God, and his Son Jeſus Chriſt, are the proper object of Divine Worſhip*; or (which is the ſame) *no Divine Worſhip*, or *no Honour due only to God, is to be given to any one but God.* Since therefore all Idolatry is inconſiſtent with the forementioned Fundamental, and Eſſential point, 'tis manifeſt, the Church of *Rome* cannot hold any kind of Idolatry whatſoever, without holding a Fundamental Errour, deſtructive to the very Eſſence, and Being of a True Church. Wherefore Dr. *St.* by granting the *Roman* Church to be a True Church, and yet charging her with Idolatry, does commit a palpable Contradiction, and in one breath blows cold and hot; aſſerting, that ſhe is a True Church, and yet that ſhe holds ſomething inconſiſtent with the very Being and Eſſence of a True Church.

To draw this Argument into a narrower circle, I form this *Dilemma.* Either by the Idolatry Dr. *St.* Fathers upon our Church, *Some Honour, due only*

to

to God, is given to a meer Creature, or not: If *not*, then it is no Idolatry, as not participating the general Notion of Idolatry: If *ſo*, then it is deſtructive to an Eſſential point of Religion; and conſequently to the Eſſence of a True Church. So that Dr. *St.* by diſtinguiſhing two ſorts of Idolatry, one deſtructive to the Being of a Church, another not-deſtructive to the Being of a Church, does as much as tell us, There are two ſorts of Idolatry; one, that *is Idolatry*, another, that is *not Idolatry*: of the former he declares us free; but of the latter, he makes us guilty. And we, poor Souls! becauſe we cannot diſcern ſuch ſubtle diſtinctions as theſe, muſt be chalked up for Half-witted men. But if the accompliſhedneſs of Dr. *St.*'s wit has no more of wit in it, then No-Idolatry has of Idolatry, we have little reaſon to envy him.

Yet farther; 'tis impoſſible, that a Church, which holds any damnable Errour, ſhould be a True Church. For all damnable Errours lead to Damnation; and upon that account are called Damnable. But a True Church carries to Salvation; and therefore muſt be

True in all things neceſſary to the obtaining thereof. Nor among thoſe things which are neceſſary to the obtaining taining of Salvation, one is the avoiding all Damnable Errours, as being deſtructive thereunto. Whence it is manifeſt, that a Church, which holds any Damnable Errour, cannot ſo long be a True Church: and to hold any Idolatry whatſoever is, without queſtion, a Damnable Errour; ſince all Idolatry is Damnable, and deſtructive to Salvation. Yea Dr. St. *pag.* 34. Charges our Church with Damnable Errours; eſpecially upon the account of the Idolatry, which, as he fancies, ſhe does teach; and which page 22. he owns to be very ſinful: neither do I believe, that the *Dr.* will dare to affirm, that a Church, which ſhould teach *Adultery to be Lawful*, could ſo long be a True Church: and yet Idolatry is no leſs damnable, and deſtructive to Salvation than *Adultery*. Wherefore to hold either of them as Lawful, is equally at leaſt deſtructive to the Being of a True Church. 'Tis therefore impoſſible, that the *Roman* Church ſhould hold any ſort of Idolatry, as Dr. *St.* will needs have

us believe she does, without holding a Damnable, and Fundamental Errour, destructive to the very Essence, and Being of a True Church.

For in the Dictionary of such, as have any insight into Religious Concerns; a Fundamental Errour in matters of Religion, a Damnable Errour, and an Errour inconsistent with the Essence of a True Church, are Terms Synonymous.

Moreover, whereas the very Vitals of a Religion are the *Honour of God* and the *Salvation of Souls*, Idolatry undermines them both; by giving the *Honour due only unto God*, to a meer Creature, and by *leading souls to Damnation*. How therefore can it chuse, but destroy the very Essence of a True Religion? And as a High Treason, whereby one does give the Honour, and Respect due only to his Sovereign, to a meer Subject, is beyond debate contrary to a Fundamental point of Loyalty, and destructive thereunto; so it is a palpable Contradiction to assert, that such a person is a *true and faithful Subject*, but yet a *Traitour*: in the like manner, since by all Idolatry, according to the

Notion thereof aſſented unto even by Dr. *St.* is given to a meer Creature *the Honour due only unto God*, and upon this account *Idolatry is High Treaſon againſt God*, Dr. *St.* muſt needs be guilty of *Self-contradiction*, in affirming the *Roman* Church to be a *True Church*, but yet *Idolatrous*. Whence appears, that the inſtance of a *Traitour*, alledged by the Dr. *page* 25. makes rather againſt him, than for him, where we muſt reflect, that according to Dr. *St.* not only the practice of the *Roman* Church, but alſo her Doctrine is Idolatrous: ſince ſhe teaches and approves of that very practice, which ſhe judges to be Idolatrous.

Hitherto we have ſhewn, that all ſorts of Idolatry are inconſiſtent with the very Eſſence of a True Church, and by conſequence, that it is a manifeſt Contradiction to affirm, that the *Roman* Church is a *True* Church, and yet depraved with Idolatry. However, 'tis enough for my purpoſe to evince, that *that ſort* of *Idolatry*, which Dr. *St.* Fathers upon the *Roman* Church, Deſtroies the very Eſſence, and

and Being of a True Church: which I ſhall prove in the following Chapter,

CHAP. VI.

Another Proof of the ſame intent, drawn from the Nature of the Idolatry, the Doctour Fathers upon the Roman *Church.*

THe Idolatry Dr. *St.* endeavours to faſten upon the *Roman* Church, is, as he pretends to prove at large in his Diſcourſe concerning the Idolatry practiſed in the Church of *Rome*; *pag.* 58. *& ſeq.* point blanck againſt the ſecond Commanded (according to their reckoning) of the Decalogue; and is immediately oppoſite thereunto. Now 'tis certain, that this Commandment contains an Eſſential, and Fundamental point of Religion, ſince it ſo neerly concerns Gods Honour, and worſhip, the chief aim of Religion. Whence it manifeſtly follows, that the Idolatry he Fathers upon the *Roman* Church, is

deſtructive to a Fundamental point of Religion, and by conſequence inconſiſtent with the very Being of a True Church.

Beſides, the Dr. does willingly confeſs, (and it would be a madneſs not to do ſo) that there is ſome ſort of Idolatry deſtructive not only to the Soundeſs, (for this is general to all ſorts of Idolatry) but alſo to the very Eſſence, and Being of a True Church. See his Anſwer *pag.* 24. whence we infer, that whatever Church holds that kind of Idolatry, which is deſtructive to the Being of a Church, cannot ſo long be a True Church whatever other Tenets ſhe maintains. So that it would have been a palpable Contradiction in Dr. *St.* even according to his own Doctrine, had he held the Church of *Rome* to be a True Church, (as he does) and yet charged her with the Forementioned kind of Idolatry. Now let us examin, what Character Dr. *St.* gives us of the Idolatry he is pleaſed to Father upon the *Roman* Church.

In his Diſcourſe concerning the Idolatry practiſed in the Church of *Rome*,

pag.

pag. 69. he ſaies thus: *It ſeems much more reaſonable for me to worſhip God by Proſtrating my ſelf to the Sun, or any of the Heavenly Bodies, nay to an Ant, or a Flie, than to a Picture or Image*; and he endeavours to prove this his Aſſertion: according to which the Idolatry he Faſtens upon the *Roman* Church, in the Veneration of the Pictures, or Images of God, is eſteemed by him far worſe than the Adoration of the Sun, Moon, an Ant, or a Flie, practiſed by the Heathens. *pag.* 132. he approves this Teſtimony of *Coſterus*: *If the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation be not true, the Idolatry of the Heathens in Worſhipping ſome Golden, or Silver Statue, or any Images of their gods; or the Laplanders in Worſhipping a red Cloath, or the Ægyptians an Animal, is more excuſable, than of Chriſtians, that Worſhip a bit of Bread.* This *Coſterus* aſſirms, only upon this condition, That the Doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation be not true: But Dr. *St.* who abſolutely judges that Doctrine not to be true, and moreover approves the foreſaid Teſtimony of *Coſterus*, muſt needs hold the Idolatry he imputes to

Ca-

Catholicks in the Adoration of the Eucharist, to be more deteſtable, than that of the Ægyptians and Laplanders.

Pag. 134. he ſeems to approve this Sentiment of Dr. *Taylour*, *An Image then becomes an Idol when Divine Worſhip is given to it: and to Worſhip Falſe Gods, or to give Divine Honor to an Image, which is no God, is all one kind of formal Idolatry* Wherefore Dr. *St.* ſince he aſſents to this Doctrine, Parallels the Veneration of Images, practiſed by the *Roman* Church, to the Worſhip of Falſe Gods, and looks upon them both as one kind of formal Idolatry; and certainly the Worſhip of Falſe Gods, as rejecting the true God, is inconſiſtent with the Being of a True Church. For what Idolatry is ſo, if this be not? In the ſame *pag.* he pretends to ſhew, that the *groſſeſt Idolatry in the world, is excuſable on the ſame grounds*, whereon we excuſe from Idolatry the Veneration of Chriſt in the Euchariſt: which he compares with the Idolatry of thoſe, who ſaid *Chriſt was the Sun*: and he adds, *pag.* 136. *That the Abſurdities of Tranſubſtantiation are greater, than of that Doctrine; which teaches*

teaches the Sun to be God; and in the ſame place he calls it as Venial a Fault; The Worſhipping that for the True God, which is not ſo; ſuch is the Idolatry he Fathers upon us, and terms it the Superſtition of an undue way of Worſhiping; as the Worſhipping Falſe Gods, which he ſtiles the Superſtition of an undue object: and *pag.* 137. he ſaies thus, *The moſt ſtupid and ſenſeleſs of all Idolaters, who Worſhip the very Images for God,* (which the wiſer among the Heathens, according to his Judgment, alwayes diſalowed) *were in truth the moſt excuſable upon this ground*; upon which we excuſe from Idolatry the Veneration we give to the Sacrament of the Altar: and by conſequence, the Idolatry he Fathers upon us in this matter, is in his opinion worſe, and leſs excuſable, than the moſt ſtupid, and ſenſeleſs Idolatry of the Heathens.

In the *page* immediately before, he compares our Veneration of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, *with the Ægyptians worſhipping the Sun for God*, and the *Iſraelites the Golden Calf, believing it was the true God.* Pag. 142, 143. ſpeaking of the

the Veneration the *Roman* Church allows to Saints, he adds, *I would willingly understand, why I may not as well honour God by giving Worship to the Sun, as to* Ignatius Loyola, *or St.* Francis, *or any other of the late Cannonized Saints?* And why does he not speak of the B. Virgin *Mary*, of the Apostles, of St. *Augustine*, and of other Ancient Saints, since he equally impugns the Veneration of all Saints? The reason he adds is excellent: *I am sure*, saies he, *the Sun is a certain Monument of Gods goodness, and I cannot be mistaken therein. But I can never be certain of the holiness of those persons, viz.* the late Cannonized Saints. ——— *For all that I can know*, Ignatius Loyola *was a great Hypocrite. But I am sure that the Sun is none.* ——— *I know the best of men have their Corruptions, and to what degree it is impossible for others to understand. But I am certain the spots of the Sun are no Moral Impurities, nor displeasing to God.* How frivolous this reason is, will clearly appear by this instance. Dr. *St.* will not deny, but that some Reverence, Respect, Esteem, and Veneration may be given in this life to

men,

men, by reaſon of their Holineſs, Sanctity, and Honeſty of Life; and that one may here upon earth implore the Prayers of other men, eſpecially Holy and Honeſt Men; or invoke them to be his Interceſſours with God in his Neceſſities; which is practiſed by Proteſtants; and no more than this we aſcribe to the Saints in Heaven.

Now according to this Reaſon of the Dr. (to uſe his own words) *Why may I not as well honour Dr.* St. *'s Cat, or Dog, (who in the common opinion of Philoſophers, as being Subſtances endowed with Life, are perfecter than the Sun) as Dr.* St. *himſelf; or invoke them as well as him, or any of the Proteſtant Biſhops, or Miniſters? I am ſure Dr.* St. *'s Cat, and Dog, do whatever God will have them do; and that they never have tranſgreſs'd any of his Commandments; and I cannot be miſtaken therein. But I can never be certain, that Dr.* St. *is an honeſt man; yea I am certain, that he has tranſgreſs'd Gods Commandments. For all that I can know Dr.* St. *is a great Hypocrite, and an errant Knave. But I am ſure Dr.* St. *'s Cat, and Dog are none. I know that Dr.* St. *has his Corruptions,*

ſince

ſince the beſt of men have theirs; and to what degree he has them, is impoſſible for me, or others, to underſtand; but I am certain, that the Blemiſhes of thoſe Creatures, ſuppoſing they have them, are no Moral Impurities, nor diſpleaſing to God.

Whence it follows, that according to this Argument of Dr. *St.* 'tis as Lawful, and more laudable, to Reverence, upon the account of Honeſty, Dr. *St.*'s Cat, or Dog, & to invoke their Interceſſion; as to Reverence Dr. *St.* himſelf, or to invoke his aſſiſtance by Prayers; and what ever anſwer Dr. *St.* ſhall give to this Inſtance, will ſolve the Objection he makes againſt us. For 'tis certain that the Sun is as uneapable to underſtand, or to be made to underſtand, our addreſſes, or to intercede for us, or to lead a moral, honeſt life, as a Cat, or a Dog: But Dr. *St.* knows too well, that it is not for his intereſt to conſider the incoherency of his Principles, or the train of Abſurdities, which commonly wait upon his Arguments. Yet for our preſent intent it is enough, to ſhew, that the Idolatry he endeavours to faſten upon the *Roman* Church, in the Invocation

tion of Saints, which she allows of, is, in his perswasion, as bad or worse, than the Adoration of the Sun.

Page 159. he makes a large Parallel between the Veneration, that *Roman* Catholicks afford to Saints, and the Idolatry of the Heathens, in Sacrificing to their Inferiour Deities, or Heroes. *Did the Israelites*, saies he, *use solemn Ceremonies of making any capable of Divine Worship? So does the* Roman *Church. Did they set up their Images in publick places of Worship, and then kneel down before them, and Invocate those represented by them? So does the* Roman *Church. Did they Consecrate Temples, and Erect Altars to them, and keep Festivals and burn Incense before them? So does the* Roman *Church. Lastly, Did they offer up Sacrifices in those Temples to the Honour of their lesser Deities, or Heroes? So does the* Roman *Church.* Whence it appears, that Dr. *St.* does hold us for as great Idolaters, by reason of the Honour we afford to Saints, as the Heathens were in Adoring their lesser Deities. All this Doctrine he had laid down in his Answer to the Questions, *pag.* 3, 4. where he

he has these words. *The same Argument whereby the Papists make the Worship of the Bread in the Eucharist not to be Idolatry, would make the grossest Heathenish Idolatry not to be so:* And a little after he saies thus; *The Church of* Rome, *in the Worship of God by Images, the Adoration of the Bread in the Eucharist, and the formal Invocation of Saints, doth require the giving to the Creature, the Worship due only to the Creator.* Whence it follows, that Dr. *St.* does Charge the *Roman* Church with an Idolatry of an undue Object; Because the Worship, due only to God, is given by us (as he fancies) to a meer Creature: and not only with Idolatry of an undue, and prohibited manmanner of Worship: which are two sorts of Idolatry he makes mention of.

In the same page, to confirm the former Doctrine, he saies thus; *In the Worship of God by Images,* wherewith he Charges us, *the Worship due to God* (and I suppose he speaks of a Worship due only to God) *is terminated wholly on the Creature.* Wherefore if this be Idolatry, it must be Idolatry of *an undue Object.*

Much

Much more to the ſame purpoſe might be alledged out of him. But what already I have produced, is ſufficient.

From what hitherto has been quoted out of Dr. *St.* 'tis manifeſt, that the Idolatry he Fathers upon the *Roman* Church is, in his opinion as bad, nay worſe, than the groſſeſt Idolatry of the Heathens. Now ſince the groſſeſt Idolatry of the Heathens is, beyond debate (and Dr. *St.* alwaies ſuppoſes it is ſo) is (I ſay) inconſiſtent with the Being, and Eſſence of a True Church, and a true Religion: and ſince the Malice of Idolatry is to be ſcanned by the oppoſition it has with Religion; this being ſo, is it not a madneſs to ſay, and confeſs, that the groſſeſt Idolatry of the Heathens is inconſiſtent, not only with the Soundneſs, but alſo with the Eſſence of a true Church; but yet that the Idolatry of the Papiſts, although as bad, nay worſe; than the groſſeſt of the Heathens, is inconſiſtent only with the Soundneſs of a Church, and not with the Eſſence. Is not this, as if one ſhould ſay, *If you cut off the head of a man, you will kill him; but if you give him another wound as bad,*

or worse; if you run him through the heart, if you cut him all in pieces, you will only make him sick? What sence can there be in affirming, that the Heathens are not members of the True Church, because they are Idolaters in so high a degree; and yet that *Roman* Catholicks, though grosser Idolaters than the Heathens, are Members of the True Church? That the Heathenish Idolatry, at least some, is of a nature high enough to unchurch Heathens; and yet that the *Roman* Idolatry, though grosser and higher than any Heathenish, is not of a nature high enough (as he saies *pag.* 22.) to unchurch *Romanists?* If this be not *Nonsense*, what is?

Moreover, from what we have alledg'd out of the Dr. 'tis evident, that he aserib's unto us Idolatry of an undue Object: and sure all such Idolatry is inconsistent with the very Being of a True Church. For Dr. *St.* when he would excuse the Idolatry he Fathers upon us, from being destructive to the very Essence of a true Church, he endeavours to say, that it is only Idolatry of an undue manner of Worship; which shews, that he holds

Ido-

Idolatry of an undue Object, to be destructive to the Essence of a Church. Since therefore he confesses, in the places above mentioned, that the Idolatry of the *Roman* Church is Idolatry of an undue Object, he makes her guilty of an Idolatry, inconsistent with the Essence of a true Church.

Again, Dr. *St.* seems to suppose, that an Idolatry, which brings in a multiplicity of Gods, is destructive to the Essence of a Church; and why? Because it is destructive, at least by consequence, and mediately, to a Fundamental point of Religion, *viz.* the Unity of the Godhead. Since therefore the Idolatry he fathers upon us, is destructive, at least mediately, to this Fundamental point, *The Honour due only to God is not to be given to a meer Creature*, assented unto even by Pagans, it must be inconsistent with the Being of a Church. For an Errour destructive to any Fundamental point of Religion whatever, is destructive to the Being of a Church, as has been demonstrated. Yea an Idolatry accompanied with the acknowledgment of one onely God, (such is the Idola-

try he imputes to us) may, doubtleſs, be inconſiſtent with the Being of a Church: as for inſtance, the Idolatry of ſuch, who acckowledging one only God, ſhould adore no other God but the Sun.

Yet farther, the Adoration of a red Cloth, which the Laplanders uſe, either is deſtructive to the Being of a Church, or not. Sure Dr. *St.* is not ſo mad as to ſay it is not. Now if it be deſtructive to the Eſſence of a Church, as certainly it is, is not Dr. *St.* aſhamed to ſay, that the Adoration of Chriſt in the Euchariſt is worſe, and leſs excuſable, than that of the Laplanders, and yet that it may be conſiſtent with the Being of a True Church? Can any one require a more convincing Argument, to prove, that ſuch a Church is no true Church; then if he can ſhew, that ſhe adores, or requires the Adoration of a red Cloth for God, or ſomething as bad, or worſe.

Laſtly, Dr. *St.* affirms, that the *Roman* Church does not only teach an Idolatry as bad or worſe, than the groſſeſt of the Heathens, but alſo that ſhe teaches it as an Article of Divine Faith, Fathering

thering it upon God, and making him the Author thereof. For the *Roman* Church delivers as Articles of Divine Faith, the Adoration of Chriſt in the Euchariſt, the Invocation of Saints, and the Veneration of Images, as both he and we confeſs. The Dr. moreover maintaines all the forementioned practices, and Doctrines to be flat Idolatry; as much, or more deteſtable, than the groſſeſt Heatheniſh Idolatry. Now certainly 'tis a Fundamental, and Eſſential point of Religion, *That God is not the Author of any Superſtition whatſoever*, much leſs of ſo groſs an Idolatry, as he will needs have the *Roman* Idolatry to be: and conſequently, 'tis impoſſible, that the *Roman* Church ſhould teach God to be the Author of ſuch an Idolatry, (as neceſſarily ſhe muſt, if ſhe teaches it as an Article of Faith) without erring againſt the aforeſaid Fundamental point; and by conſequence, without incurring a Fundamental Errour, deſtructive to the very Being of a Church.

'Tis manifeſt therefore, that Dr. *St.* does commit a palpable Contradiction,

by asserting the *Roman* Church to be a True Church, and yet charging her with an Idolatry as bad, or worse, than the grossest of the Heathens. I know not whether these lines will fetch blood from Dr. *St.* for (as he saies, *Pref. Gen.* he was threatned with such lines from his Adversaries) But I am sure, that if he has any blood in him, and has not lost all sense of his honour, they will fetch the blood into his face, and make him blush.

After the Dr. had proved unsuccessful in shewing my way of proceeding disingenuous, he endeavours to prove it *sophistical*, and *captious*, saying, *pag.* 25. *That the starting of a new Objection, or the raising a new Difficulty answers no Argument*; and that this manner of proceeding of mine, *is a clear evidence of a sophistical, and cavilling humour, rather than of any intention to satisfie an inquisitive mind.* To this I answer, When the Disciples of the Pharisees, and Officers of *Herod* came to tempt our Saviour, (*Mat.* 22.) they proposed unto him a question, and our Saviour starting a new question, and raising a new Difficulty

culty, ſolved the queſtion propoſed unto him, and ſilenced his Adverſaries. But had Dr. *St.* been with the Enemies of Chriſt in that occaſion, he would have ſuggeſted unto them, *That it was a clear evidence of a ſophiſtical, and cavelling humour*, in order to anſwer one queſtion, to ſtart another. Beſides, what queſtion, or difficulty do I ſtart? I take for granted, that *the Roman Church is a true Church*, as Dr. *St.* has heretofore, and does ſtill grant: and hence I prove the nullity of the Charge he laies againſt us: which is the common way of confuting an Adverſary; *viz. Out of Principles granted by him, to infer the contradictory of what he maintains.* But Dr. *St.* had charged me with *Sophiſtry*, and *Captiouſneſs*; and he muſt make it good the beſt way he can: which is to feign his Adverſary to ſay what he does not.

CHAP. VII.

The Invalidity of the Doctor's Answers to our Propositions in Particular.

LEt us see now, for the greater satisfaction of the Reader, what he Answers to every particular Proposition I laid down in order, to prove him guilty of Self contradiction, in Charging us with Idolatry; and to clear our Church from so foul an Aspersion: my first Proposition was this:

'Tis an Article of Faith, and a Fundamental point of Religion, That the Honour which is due only to God, is not to be given to a meer Creature. This Proposition the Dr. absolutely grants, without any distinction, saying, *pag.* 26. *His first Proposition I agree to.* He adds afterwards, *That there is no dispute between us whether that Honour, which is due only to God, may be given to a Creature*; and finally, he grants this Proposition *to be in it self true.* But after he had absolutely granted it, without any distinction,

on, he begins to quibble at it. But I desire he would tell me, whether the exception he afterwards makes against it, does hinder, or not, the absolute truth thereof? If it does not, what more can I, or any one else desire, when we lay down Principles, or Propositions, than that the Proposition we advance be absolutely true? If it does hinder the absolute truth of the aforesaid Proposition, why did he grant it absolutely without any distinction? But what is the exception he makes against us in this Proposition? He saies, *We should have discust, what that Honour is, which is due only to God.* Wherein he adds, *there is a great dispute between them and us.* So that it seems, he would have had us lay down, among the Principles, which we advanced against him, some thing that is disputed between us: which is point blank against the very notion of a Principle; which ought to he agreed unto by all, or at least by the Adversary, with whom we deal. So that he accuses us, that we proceed Sophistically, and Captiously: and why? Because (forsooth) we do not lay down for a Principle, that which

which is not a Principle: which doubtleſs is a frivolous accuſation. Neither was there any need, we ſhould diſcuſs in particular, *what that Honour is which is due only to God.* For, the Honour we give to Images, or Saints, either is *due only to God, or not.* If the Dr. ſaies it is; then it is a palpable Contradiction, for the Dr. to affirm that our Church is True, and yet that ſhe allows Saints and Images ſuch an Honour. If he ſaies it is not, then how can he accuſe our Church of Idolatry, becauſe ſhe gives to Saints and Images ſuch an Honour? Wherefore, without deſcending to the particular Honour due only to God, we prove, that either Dr. *St.* muſt confeſs, that our Church is free from the aforeſaid Idolatray, or that he contradicts himſelf; which was my proper task in that place: and is not this enough?

He adds, *pag.* 27. *That it cannot excuſe us from Idolatry,* to ſay, *That we acknowledge it to be Idolatry, to give that Honour, which we ſuppoſe to be due only to God, to a meer Creature,* in caſe that he can prove, that we give *to meer Creatures any part of that Honour which is due*

to

to God. I do confeſs, that were it once proved, that we give any Honour, duly only to God to a meer Creature, ſuch an acknowledgment would not excuſe us from Idolatry; as it did not excuſe the Heathens from the like Crime, although they acknowledged the ſame Truth. But here we muſt reflect, That ſometimes the Dr. ſaies, that 'tis Idolatry to give to a meer Creature, *the Honour due only to God*: and in that he ſaies the truth: Othertimes, as in this place, he omits only, and ſpeaks of *Honour due to God*. For ſome honour is due to God; but not only to God. As when our Saviour was upon earth, without doubt the Honour of kneeling down before him, was due unto him: which Honour notwitſtanding is due unto a King, and to ones Father. But what is all this, that Dr. *St.* ſets down in this Paragraph, to clear himſelf from Self-contradiction, in aſſerting our Church to be a true Church, and yet charging her with Idolatry? which was the deſign in this ſecond part of his Anſwer; and my immediate intention, in *Dr. Stillingfleet againſt Dr. Stillingfleet*, was to prove him

him guilty of Self-contradiction, as he ſaies, *page* 28. *His immediate intention was not to clear their Church from Idolatry, but to accuſe me of Contradiction*: yet I have ſhewn above, that if I evince that he contradicts himſelf *in the way I inſiſt upon*, I do manifeſtly clear our Church from Idolatry; and that this part was of my deſign.

My 2d Propoſition was, as follows. *To teach Idolatry, is to err againſt the fore-mentioned Article of Faith, & Fundamental point of Religion*, i. e. (as he ſaies) to teach Idolatry, is to teach *That the Honour which is due only to God, is to be given* (I ſayed *may be given*) *to a meer Creature.* To this ſecond Propoſition he Anſwers thus, *pag.* 27. That *this is to teach Idolatry, no one queſtions*: but he adds, *that they who do not teach this*, i. e. that the Honour which is due only to God, may be given to a meer Creature; *may yet teach Idolatry*: and therefore he ſaies, *We ſhould, if we had proceeded as we ought to have done, have laid down an univerſal Negative*, viz. *No Church, that does not teach this, can be guilty of Idolatry; and not a particular Affirmative*, as

as he fancies this Propoſition of mine to be, *To teach Idolatry, is to teach, that the Honour due only to God may be given to a meer Creature.* Hence we may diſcover, how great a Logician Dr. *St.* is. I wonder how he ſhould fancy that Propoſition of mine to be a particular Affirmative; and not an Univerſal. Is this Propoſition a particular Affirmative, *To be a man* is to be *Animal rationale*? Sure no body that underſtands any thing of Rationality, can take ſuch a Propoſition for a particular Affirmative: and as the true Notion of a man in general is *Animal rationale*; ſo the true notion of Idolatry, according to Dr. *St.* himſelf, *pag.* 24. quoted above, is, *giving the Honour due only to God, to a meer Creature.* Wherefore theſe two Propoſitions are univerſal Affirmatives, equivalent to theſe, *To be any man whatſoever, is to be Animal rationale*; *To teach any Idolatry whatſoever, is to teach, that the Honour due only to God, may be given to a meer Creature.*

The reaſon hereof is, becauſe, as Logicians tell us, an indefinite Propoſition in a neceſſary matter, (ſuch is the Notion of a Thing; which muſt neceſ-

ſarily

ſarily agree unto it) is equivalent to an Univerſal; as to ſay a man is *Animal rationale*, is as much as to ſay, *every man is ſuch*; and to ſay, Idolatry is *the giving to a meer creature the honour due only to God*, (which is the true notion of Idolatry in general) is the ſame, as if one ſhould ſay *All Idolatry is ſuch*. Now if this Univerſal Affirmative be true, as it is, even according to Dr. *St.*'s confeſſion, a Church that teaches any ſort of Idolatry whatſoever, does teach, that *the Honour which is due only to God, may be given to a meer Creature*: and hence it neceſſarily follows, That no Church, that does not teach this, can be guilty of any ſort of Idolatry; as becauſe every man is *animal rationale* (a rational Animal) it muſt needs follow, that nothing, that is not *animal rationale*, can be a man; whoever has the leaſt ſmattering of Logick, cannot be ignorant of theſe Rules. But it was not for Dr. *St.*'s purpoſe to remember any thing of Logick, or of Rationality. Whence I conclude, that the Propoſition layed down by me is an Univerſal Affirmative, equivalent to the Propoſition ſet down by the Dr. Since therefore

fore no Church can teach any Idolatry, without teaching, that *the Honour which is due only to God, may be given to a meer Creature*, it is evidently inferred, that no Church can teach any Idolatry, without erring againſt the forementioned *Article of Faith*, and *Fundamental point of Religion*: which is all I pretended in my ſecond Propoſition.

Beſides, although I ſhould grant, (as I do not) that a Church might teach ſome ſort of Idolatry, without teaching, or requiring, that *the Honour due only to God, be given to a meer Creature*; yet, according to Dr. *St.*'s own confeſſion, the Idolatry he Fathers upon the *Roman* Church, is ſuch, that it requires the honour which is due only to God, to be given to a meer Creature. For in his Diſcourſe concerning the *Roman* Idolatry, *pag.* 3. he has theſe words, *The Church of* Rome, *in the Worſhip of God by Images, the Adoration of the Bread in the Euchariſt, and the formal Invocation of Saints, doth require giving to the Creature Worſhip due only to the Creator.* So that according to this Aſſertion of Dr. *St.* which he endeavours to eſtabliſh through-

throughout that whole Diſcourſe, no Church can teach the Idolatry he fathers upon the *Roman* Church, without teaching the *giving to a meer Creature, the Honor & Worſhip due only to the Creator:* and conſequently without erring againſt that Aricle of Faith, and Fundamental point of Religion, contained in my firſt Propoſition: which is enough for my main intent. So that, if my ſecond Propoſition be propounded thus, *To teach that ſort of Idolatry, which* Dr. *St.* Fathers upon the *Roman* Church, is to err againſt the forementioned Article of Faith, and Fundamental point of Religion, he will have nothing to quibble at it; ſince he expreſsly aſſerts, that ſuch a kind of Idolatry requires the contrary to that Article. whence I conclude, that this ſecond Propoſition is alſo agreed unto by Dr. *St.* either abſolutely, or at leaſt as far, as is neceſſary for my purpoſe.

My third Propoſition runs thus: *A Church that does not err againſt any Article of Faith, nor againſt any Fundamental point of Religion, does not teach Idolatry.* To this Propoſition he anſwers, That *it*

is

is very Sophiſtical and Captious. Dr. *St.* ſeems to be poſſeſs'd with ſuch a panick fear to be Non-pluſs'd by me, that had I ſaid *two and two are four*, in all likelyhood he would have called it a *Sophiſtical and Captious Propoſition.* And this is a common flaw in weak, but obſtinate defendants; who, when they have nothing to ſay againſt a Propoſition, they Characteriſe it for Sophiſtical. But let us ſee in what conſiſts the Sophiſtry, and Captiouſneſs of this Propoſition. He ſaies, *pag.* 28, 29. *That if by Article of Faith, and Fundamental point of Religion, he means the main Fundamental points of Doctrine contained in the Apoſtles Creed, then a Church, which does own all the Fundamentals of Doctrine, may be guilty of Idolatry, and teach thoſe things, wherein it lies.* But where is Dr. *St.*'s ingenuity? My Propoſition was not That a Church which owns all Fundamentals, does not teach Idolatry; but that a Church which does not err againſt any Fundamental, does not teach Idolatry: which is very different; becauſe a Church may err againſt a Doctrine which ſhe owns, and contradict her ſelf,

as has been hinted at above, and Dr. *St.* himſelf agrees unto, as hereafter will appear. So that the Dr. does not deny my Propoſition; but another very different. We may therefore take my Propoſition for granted: yea we have ſhewn already, that any Fundamental Errour, or an Errour againſt any Fundamental point, great or little, if there be any Fundamental point of little concern, is deſtructive to the Being of a Church.

He goes on, and ſaies, *But if by erring againſt an Article of Faith be meant, that a Church, which does not err at all in matters of Religion, cannot teach Idolatry*, then he concludes the Propoſition is *true*, but *impertinent*. Neither does this part of the diſtinction touch my Propoſition. For all matters of Religion are not Articles of Faith, according to Dr. *St* who does not think all the 39. Articles to be Articles of Faith; yet he judges them all to be Articles, or matters of Religion, and to concern the Soundneſs of a Church, but not the Eſſence: nay, we do not hold, that all the Ceremonies of our Church, and all our Eccleſiaſtical Precepts are Articles of

of Faith; yet they may be called matters of Religion. Wherefore these two Propositions, *A Church that does not err against any Article of Faith, and a Church that does not err at all in matters of Religion*, are very different: neither does the former Proposition contain the latter. Is not this when a learned distinction, wherein neither part touches the Proposition, which the Author pretends to distinguish, whereas, according to all reason, Both Members of the Distinction are to be contained in the word, which is distinguished?

Would it not be ridiculous for one to distinguish thus the following Proposition, *Every man is a rational Animal?* if by *Man* be meant *all kind of Animals*, 'tis false: But if by Man be meant only that kind of Animal, which is man, 'tis true. For as a man does not signifie all kind of Animals, but only a certain kind: So neither an Article of Faith does signifie all matters of Religion; but only certain points. So that Dr. *St.*'s distinction comes to be this: *If by Articles of Faith, and Fundamental points of Religion* be understood not on-

ly *Articles of Faith*, and *Fundamental points*, but alſo *other points*, which are neither *Articles of Faith*, nor *Fundamental*; i. e. if by theſe words he underſtood, *what they do not ſignifie*, then very wiſely the Dr. ſaies *pag.* 28. *The Propoſition is true, but impertinent*: as certainly it is impertinent. But who makes it ſo? But if by *Articles of Faith*, and *Fundamental points of Religion*, be only underſtood *Articles of Faith*, and *Fundamental points of Religion*, as whoever has any underſtanding in him, muſt needs underſtand; Then —— what then? —— he ſaies not a word to the Propoſition layed down by me, *viz. A Church that does not err againſt any Article of Faith, nor againſt any Fundamental point of Religion, does not teach Idolatry*: Whereas, according to the common Rules of diſtinguiſhing Propoſitions, he ſhould have told us, whether our Propoſition, qualified with that part of the Diſtinction, was true, or falſe: But he coggs in another Propoſition very different, ſaying, *That a Church, which does not own all Fundamentals of Doctrine, may be guilty of Idolatry.*

dolatry. Let any one judge, whether this be not downright juggling. Whence the Reader may eaſily ſee, to what extremities this poor man is brought, to make good againſt us his pretended Charge of Idolatry, and to clear himhimſelf from Self-contradiction.

Moreover, either he does admit *other Articles of Faith*, and *Fundamental points of Religion*, beſides thoſe which are *contained in the Apoſtles Creed*, or not: if he does admit others, then the Diſtinction would run thus; If by not erring againſt *any Article of Faith* be underſtood, that a Church, which does not err againſt *ſome certain Articles of Faith*, cannot teach Idolatry; *i. e.* if in place of my Propoſition, which is an *Univerſal Negative*, be put in another Propoſition very different, *viz.* a *Particular Negative*, then the Propoſition, which he puts in, may be falſe; as certainly it may be: for a Church may teach Idolatry, without erring againſt *every Article* of Faith: as the Heathens, who admitted a Deity and a Religion, did not err againſt every Article of Faith, though they taught Idolatry. But this

cannot hinder the truth of my Propoſition; which was an *Univerſal Negative*, viz. *not erring againſt any*; when as his Propoſition would be a *particular Negative*, viz. *not erring againſt ſome*. As, this *univerſal is true, a man that does not tranſgreſs any of Gods Commandments, is a good man*; but this other particular may be falſe, *A man that does not tranſgreſs ſome certain Commandments of God*, *viz.* thoſe, which concern immediately the honour of God, *is a good man*: neither could the falſity of this latter Propoſition obſtruct the truth of the former.

But if Dr. *St.* admits no Articles at all of Faith, nor Fundamental points, which are not contained, explicitely nor implicitely, in the Apoſtles Creed, then he muſt needs reduce to the Apoſtles Creed the Article quoted in my firſt Propoſition, *viz. The honour, which is due only to God, is not to be given to a meer Creature*; ſince he grants this to be an Article of Faith, and a Fundamental point of Religion, as has been ſeen; and doubtleſs 'tis a main Fundamental point too.

And

And this is enough for the truth of our third Propoſition: For, if a Church does not err againſt any Article of Faith, even of thoſe which the Dr. grants to be ſuch, ſhe does not err againſt the forementioned Article, which even the Dr. places amongſt Articles of Faith: and if it does not err againſt this Article, it does not teach Idolatry, at leaſt that kind of Idolatry, which he is pleaſed to father upon us. For to teach any ſort of Idolatry, at leaſt that which the Dr. laies to our charge, is to err againſt the aforeſaid Article, (which not only in our opinion, but alſo in the opinion of the Dr. and other Proteſtants, is an Article of Faith) as does manifeſtly appear, by what has been handled in our Second Propoſition.

My fourth Propoſition was framed thus. *The Church of Rome does teach Veneration of Images, Adoration of the Hoaſt, and Invocation of Saints.* To this Dr. *St.* page 29. anſwers, *That it is agreed on by both ſides*, without adding any more. Now I ſee the Dr. takes heart, and dares to grant a Propoſition ſet down by me, without ſtigmatizing it

either before or after, for Sophistical and Captious. Hence I infer, that the Veneration of Images, Adoration of the Hoast, and Invocation of the Saints, are Doctrines of the *Roman* Church; and by consequence they are not *meer practices* of *Roman-Catholicks*. For when a practice of the members of any Church is taught, and approved by the Church her self, then such a practice comes to be the Doctrine of that Church. This I have said, because sometimes Dr. *St.* does seem to look upon the forementioned points, as *meer practices* of *Roman-Catholicks*: and it is certain, that a Church may be a True Church, and yet the Members thereof practice some things contrary to the Doctrine, and Tenets of the Church, whose members they are. For the Dr. will not deny, that among Protestants there are some, nay many, who although they assent to the Tenets of the Protestant Church, do contradict, in their practice, the Doctrine they profess to believe, being Adulterers, Thieves, Perjurers, and Drunkards, living as if there were no God, according to that

of

of St. *Paul, Titus* 1. 16. quoted by Dr. *St. pag.* 25. ſpeaking of ſome, who profeſs that *they know God, but in works they deny him.* And yet ſure the Dr. will not therefore affirm, that the Proteſtant Church is not a true, and ſound Church. However, ſhould ſhe teach Adultery, Thieving, and Perjury to be lawful, or that *there is no God*, certainly the Dr. in that caſe would not hold her for a True, much leſs for a Sound Church, Our preſent debate therefore is concerning the Doctrines of the *Roman* Church; and whether Dr. *St.* does not Contradict himſelf, by aſſerting, that the *Roman* Church is a True Church, and yet that ſhe does teach Idolatry, or thoſe things wherein it lies.

My fifth, and laſt Propoſition goes thus; *The Roman Church does not err againſt any Article of Faith, or Fundamental point of Religion.* Dr. *St.* does confeſs, *pag.* 29. *That this is his Conceſſion: from whence all the force of our Argument is taken:* and we do not deny, but that this Conceſſion of the Dr. is of great concern in order to our preſent Deſign. All the endeavours therefore of the

the Dr. are bent to ſhew in *what ſenſe this Conceſſion is made by him, and of what force it is in this preſent Debate.* I prove this to be Dr. *St.*'s Sentiment, (which ſome did queſtion, when my book firſt came forth, as I inſinuated above) from ſeveral places, quoted out of his *Rat. Account:* amongſt the reſt I alledged the *page* 54, 55. where he affirms (adding that this is the ſenſe of the *Engliſh* Church) That thoſe points, which they defend in oppoſition to the *Roman* Church, and wherein only they impeach us of Errours, agreeing with us in the reſt, *are meer pious Opinions, and inferiour Truths, which no body is obliged to believe,* either *neceſſitate medij*, or *neceſſitate præcepti*: and conſequently that they are not Articles of Faith, or Fundamental points of Religion; every one being obliged, either *neceſſitate medij*, or *neceſſitate Præcepti*, to believe all ſuch points: and he expreſsly aſſerts in the foremention'd pages, praiſing thence the moderation of the *Engliſh* Church, that ſhe does not acknowledge any thing, as an Article of Faith, which is not acknowledged as ſuch by *Rome* it ſelf. Since there-

therefore 'tis manifeſt, that *Rome* does not acknowledge as Articles of Faith, thoſe Points which the *Engliſh* Church maintains in oppoſition to her, it evidently follows, according to Dr. *St.*'s Conceſſion, that neither the Church of *England* does acknowledge ſuch points as Articles of Faith.

Whence I ſhew'd the truth of this our Propoſition, againſt Dr. *St.* and his Cabal. The ſubſtance of the Argument is this.

The Church of *Rome* does not err, nor cannot err, againſt any Article of Faith, or Fundamental point of Religion; unleſs the points, at leaſt ſome of them, againſt which ſhe is ſuppoſed to err, be Articles of Faith, or Fundamental points of Religion. This is evident.

But none of theſe points, againſt which Dr. *St.* ſuppoſes the *Roman* Church to err, are in his opinion either Articles of Faith, or Fundamental points of Religion, as manifeſtly appears by what we have quoted even now out of him: for he ſuppoſes her to err only againſt thoſe points, wherein the Church of *England* differs from us; which in his

his opinion are no Articles of Faith.

Therefore, according to Dr. *St.*'s opinion, the *Roman* Church does not err againſt any Article of Faith, or Fundamental point of Religion; which is the Propoſition ſet down by me.

Neither can the Dr. ſay, that although the Church of *Rome* does err immediately only againſt thoſe points, which the *Engliſh* Church defends in oppoſition unto her; yet theſe points being connexed with Articles of Faith, ſhe cannot err againſt theſe, without erring mediately, and by conſequence, againſt Articles of Faith: he cannot, I ſay, affirm this. For otherwiſe he would never grant this our Fifth Propoſition, as he does: Becauſe to err mediately againſt an Article, is to err againſt that, and another point too; and ſo he ſhould abſolutely have denyed, That the *Roman* Church does not err againſt any Article of Faith: which he does not. In the like manner it would be ridiculous to affirm, *That one did not kill ſuch a man*, becauſe he did not immediately deſtroy the Union between the Soul, and the Body; in the diſſolution whereof death for-

formally conſiſts; but only mediately and by conſequence, becauſe he deſtroyed ſome diſpoſition, neceſſary to the conſervation of that Union: as if one Arraigned for having killed a man, ſhould anſwer, *That he did not kill him; That he only cut off his Head.* Nay, if thoſe particular Tenets of the Proteſtant Church are ſo connexed, and linked with Articles of Faith, that whoever denies, or deſtroies the former, muſt alſo deny, and deſtroy the latter, one would be obliged *neceſſitate medij*, or *præcepti*, not to diſſent from ſuch points; Becauſe we are obliged not to deny any Article of Faith; and conſequently not to deny any thing, which being once denyed, an Article of Faith is alſo denyed, and caſhiered: which is contrary to what he aſſerts in the place above quoted: where he affirms, that men are prohibited to oppoſe them [particular Tenets of the *Engliſh* Church] exteriourly, but not to diſſent from them interiourly: So becauſe men are prohibited to kill others, they are obliged, not to deſtroy any Diſpoſition, whereon the life of man neceſſarily depends.

Nor

Nor is this Fifth Propoſition laid down by me, only as Dr. *St.*'s and his Aſſociates opinion; but, as I proved in my Book, it is alſo the common aſſertion of other Proteſtants; ſome of them averring This to be the judgment of all Learned Proteſtants, accuſing the contrary party of their Brethren of *an ignorant Zeal*; and King *James* adds they *are worthy to be burnt*. Hence is that common ſpeech of Proteſtants, boaſting of their Charity therein, that the *Roman* Church doth not teach *any Errour Fundamental, Damnable, or Deſtructive to Salvation*; That ſhe does not err in the *Foundations*, but in the *Superſtructures*; nor in *Fundamentals*, but only in *Not-fundamentals*; nor againſt *Articles of Faith*, but againſt *inferiour Truths* only. Now to err in *Fundamentals*, or to admit a *Fundamental* Errour, is to err againſt a *Fundamental Truth*. Whence I conclude, that according to the conſtant perſwaſion, not only of Dr. *St.* and his Partizans, but alſo of all Learned Proteſtants, *The Roman Church does not Err againſt any Article of Faith, or Fundamental point of Religion*; which was

was the very Propoſition I laid down in the fifth, and laſt place.

Let's examin yet farther, how Dr. *St.* ſtill boggles at the forementioned Propoſition. All that in ſubſtance he ſaies is this, *That he never granted the Roman Church to be a Sound Church*, or conſequently, that ſhe did not err in ſome matters of Religion, requiſite to the *Soundneſs*, and *Integrity* of a Church: neither can he ſhew, that I alledged him to the contrary: neither does this fifth Propoſition expreſs any ſuch thing, as is manifeſt. What therefore here, and in other places, he confeſſedly grants, is, *That our Church is a True Church, unerring againſt all Fundamental, and Eſſential points of Religion, and againſt all Articles of Faith*: which is all that is neceſſary to the *abſolute Truth* of the forementioned Propoſition. Wherefore, as it would be very abſurd to anſwer one, who intending only to prove ſuch a perſon not to be dead, ſhould take this Propoſition, *Such a perſon is yet a true man, retaining all the Eſſentials of a man*, to anſwer (I ſay) that what he avouches of him is *true*; but that ſuch a perſon

perſon is not a *ſound* man: So it is very impertinent, when I propoſed only to him, that the *Roman* Church does not err againſt any *Article of Faith, or Fundamental point of Religion*, requiſite to the *Eſſence* of a True Church, (as all *Fundamental* points are) to tell me, that the *Roman* Church does err againſt *ſome points* of Religion, requiſite only to the *Soundneſs* of a Church: ſuch as he fancies the particular Tenets of the Proteſtant Church to be: which is to tell me in plain *Engliſh*, That *what I ſay is true*, but *what I ſay not is falſe*: which anſwer is very impertinent, and good for nothing, but to trifle away the time.

And hence will appear, of what force this Conceſſion of Dr. *St.* is to our preſent Deſign; which is to ſhew him guilty of Self-contradiction, by granting our Church, not to err againſt any *Fundamental* point of Religion; and yet affirming that ſhe teaches Idolatry, and ſuch groſs Idolatry. For, to teach Idolatry, eſpecially ſuch a groſs Idolatry, as he is pleaſed to Father upon us, is, according to his own expreſs aſſertion,

to

to teach, or require, *that the Honour, or Worſhip due only to the Creator, be given to to a Creature*; and to teach this is to err againſt the contrary Truth, *viz. The Honour which is due only to the Creator, is not to be given to a Creature*, as is evident: and conſequently it is to err againſt a Fundamental point of Religion. For ſuch does Dr. *St.* acknowledge to be the aforeſaid Truth. Whence I conclude, that to ſay our Church does not err againſt any Fundamental point; and yet that ſhe does teach ſuch groſs Idolatry, as he is pleaſed to faſten upon her, is to ſay, *That ſhe does not err againſt any, and yet that ſhe does err againſt ſome:* which is a palpable Contradiction.

Were the Idolatry he Fathers upon us, deſtructive only to ſomething requiſite meerly to the Soundneſs of a Church, and to ſome Non-fundamental point, his diſtinction would have been to ſome purpoſe. But ſince the Idolatry he laies to our Charge, is deſtructive, according to our own Conceſſion, to ſomething requiſite to the very Being of a Church, *viz.* to a Fundamental, and Eſſential point; the forementioned Di-

ſtinction of the Truth, and Soundneſs of a Church is altogether frivolous.

Finally, Dr. *St.* *pag.* 32. ſpeaking in particular concerning our fifth Propoſition ſaies, *That if this Aſſertion, The Church of Rome does not err againſt any point neceſſary to Salvation, be only meant of thoſe Eſſential points of Faith*, which he ſuppoſes *antecedently neceſſary to the Being of a Church*, he denies it not; and he makes the antient Creeds of the Catholick Church, (before he had made mention only of the Apoſtles Creed) *to be the beſt meaſure of thoſe things, which were believed to be neceſſary to Salvation.* But he adds That *he does not ſee, of what uſe the forementioned Conceſſion of his can be to us in the preſent debate, unleſs we can ſhew* (which he ſuppoſes we are never able to doe) *that whatever Church does embrace the antient Creeds, and own all the Articles of Faith, which are contained in them, cannot be guilty of Idolalatry.* But this anſwer of the Dr. is lyable to the ſame exceptions we produced againſt him, in the Explanation of our Third Propoſition. For 'tis a very different thing to ſay, *A Church, that em-*

embraces, and owns all Essential points of Faith, (which is the Dr.'s Proposition) *and a Church that does not err against any Essential point of Faith*; (which is our Proposition, tacitely at least granted by him:) For a Church may contradict her self, and err against those very points, which she embraces, and owns: how can the *Roman* Church be a True Church, as the Dr. often confesses she is, unless she be free from all Fundamental Errours? and how can she be free from all Fundamental Errours, if she errs against any Fundamental point? and finally, how does she not err against a Fundamental point, if she teaches Idolatry, yea the grossest Idolatry of the world?

Whence I conclude, that not only this main Proposition is granted by him in the sense I pretend, *viz.* That *the Roman Church does not err against any Article of Faith, or Fundamental point of Religion*, even of those, which he acknowledges to be such: but also, that this his Concession is effectual to evince our present design, *viz.* to clear the *Roman* Church from the Idolatry cast upon

on her, and to prove the Dr. guilty of Self-contradiction, by granting, that the *Roman* Church does not err againſt any Fundamental point of Faith, and yet charging her with Idolatry, and with ſuch groſs Idolatry.

To ſay the truth, I would never deſire an Adverſarie to grant me more, in order to confute him, than Dr. *St.* has, and does grant in the preſent debate. For theſe Five Propoſitions ſet down by me, are either abſolutely granted by the Dr. or at leaſt not denyed by him *in the ſenſe I pretended*; as is apparent, by what has been diſcuſs'd: and we take this Non-denial of the Dr. for a grant, or conſent; according to that Maxime, *Qui tacet, conſentire videtur.* And certainly had he thought them falſe, he would have denyed them: whenas he does not ſo much as deny one of them, *in the ſenſe intended*; but ſome other Propoſitions very different.

Wherefore theſe Propoſitions being granted in the conformity aforeſaid, the method I took was to deduce from them the contradictory of the Calumny caſt upon our Church by Dr. *St.* For, to lay down

down Propoſitions, or Principles, and to deduce nothing from them, is, as if one ſhould lay Foundations without building the Superſtructures: as to make Deductions without firſt laying Principiples, (as ſome do) is to build without Foundation. And becauſe ſome cannot, others will not make by themſelves the deductions; eſpecially when they are contrary to what formerly they have imbibed, and are reſolved to maintain, I thought it beſt to make them to their hand. However, becauſe the main, nay the ſole, exception, that ſome perſons had againſt my Book, was, becauſe I uſed a Scholaſtick Method, framing my deductions in a ridged Syllogiſtical form, it ſeems to me expedient, for the ſatisfaction of ſuch perſons, to produce here the reaſons, that moved me thereunto: which are theſe.

Firſt, Becauſe this method I took, is a cloſe, clear, ſhort, and convincing way; and ſince I deſired, in a matter of ſo great concern, and not having too much time, to be quick, cloſe, clear, and ſhort with my Adverſary, in order to convince him of Self-contradicti-

on, I made choice of this Method.

Secondly, all Diſcourſes whatſoever, looſe, or not looſe, do neceſſarily imply ſome Syllogiſme; wherein the truth one endeavours to prove, is inferred, or pretended to be inferred, from ſome Principles. And although all kinds of Diſcourſes are obnoxious to Fallacies, and Sophiſtry; yet this difference there is between Looſe, or Rhetorical Diſcourſes, and Logical, or not Looſe, that in Rhetorical Diſcourſes, as being commonly interlaced with ſeveral digreſſions, and gay Metaphors, which amuze the Reader, the fallacy is eaſily diſguiſed. But in ridged Syllogiſtical Diſcourſes, deveſted from gaudy Expreſſions, quaint Metaphors, and unneceſſary digreſſions, the Fallacy, if there be any, is with far leſs difficulty detected. And this is the reaſon, that when we will manifeſt the Sophiſtry of a looſe diſcourſe, we do commonly reduce it to a Syllogiſtical form, the better to diſcover it. Now becauſe I deſired to deal fairly, and ſincerely with Dr. *St.* I made uſe of this method; to the end, that were there any fallacie in my Syllogiſms, it might

might more eaſily appear unto him. And although in almoſt every page he impeaches me of Sophiſtry & Captiouſneſs, yet he do's not legally ſhew any one of my Syllogiſms to be lyable to any of the Fallacies, the Logicians make mention of: and one would think, that a Dr. or of Divinity ſhould not be ignorant of them: and all that he does in this kind is, as appears by the inſtances above produced, Firſt he feigns me to ſpeak what I do not, and then he affirms, that I ſpeak Sophiſtically, and Captiouſly.

Thirdly, 'tis the common ſtile of our Polemical Divines here in *England*, whether Catholicks or Proteſtants, to uſe this Syllogiſtical way, both in their Books and conferences, concerning matters of Religion, when they will write or ſpeak cloſe to the Subject they handle. Let my Adverſary be a preſident; who in his Anſwer to the two Queſtions propoſed by one of the Church of *Rome*, he reduces almoſt all his Diſcourſes to formal Syllogiſms, although he laboured that Anſwer, only for the ſatisfaction of a Lady; and La-

dies do not uſe to be much verſt in Artificial Logick, or formal Syllogiſms. And in the late Diſputes betwen the Annabaptiſts and Quakers, the greateſt of their Auditory being made up of Women and Tradeſmen, who have not frequented Univerſities, yet their Arguments were framed in a Syllogiſtical way.

Since therefore I had never heard this common method of treating Controverſies reprehended in our Divines, Proteſtants or Catholicks; and being moreover inclined thereunto, as having been bred, the greateſt part of my life in Famous Univerſities, where a Scholaſtick, and Dialectical method is moſt in vogue, I thought no juſt exception would be made againſt me, ſhould I indulge my ſelf in a thing nothing extravagant, and ſuitable to my inclination: eſpecially when I intended my Book particularly for learned men, who are not unacquainted with Syllogiſms. And for the ſatisfaction of Proteſtants in this matter, 'twill without doubt be enough to ſee, that my Adverſary, Dr. *St.* although he ſeems to have been reſolved

to

to pardon me in nothing which he could find to be any way obnoxious to his Reproofs, has not carped at me upon this account. However, if any one be not ſatisfied with theſe Reaſons, he may paſs over the Formal Syllogiſms, laid down at the cloſing of each point, in *Dr. Stillingfleet againſt Dr. Stillingfleet*: only I deſire him to make the Deduction by himſelf, in the manner he ſhall think beſt.

The Two Syllogiſms therefore, wherewith, out of the Propoſitions above mentioned, and aſſented unto by the Doctor, I demonſtrated the *Roman* Church to be free from Idolatry in the *Veneration of Images*, *Adoration of the Hoaſt*, and *Invocation of Saints*, were theſe:

A Church that does not err againſt any *Article of Faith*, or *Fundamental point of Religion*, does not teach Idolatry. See *Prop.* 3.

But the *Roman* Church is a Church, that does not err againſt any *Article of Faith*, *or Fundamental point of Religion*. See *Prop.* 5.

Therefore ſhe does not teach *Idolatry*.

But

But ſhe does teach *Veneration of Images*, *Adoration of Chriſt in the Euchariſt*, and *Invocation of Saints*. See *Prop.* 4.

Therefore none of theſe Practices, as taught, and allowed of, by the *Roman* Church, are Idolatry.

We may add this farther Diſcourſe: A Church, that does not err againſt this Fundamental point, *viz. The Honour due only to the Creator, is not to be given to the Creature*, does not teach Idolatry; all Idolatry being deſtructive to the forementioned point. See *Prop.* 3.

But ſuch is the *Roman* Church, as is evident by the fifth Propoſition.

Therefore ſhe does not teach *Idolatry*.

And hence manifeſtly appears, how palpably Dr. *St.* Contradicts himſelf, in charging the *Roman* Church with Idolatry, and yet granting her to be a True Church, unerring againſt *all Fundamentals*. For it is as much, as if he had ſaid, ſhe does *not err againſt any Fundamental point*, yet ſhe *does err againſt ſome*.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

Several Quibbles againſt the aforeſaid Doctrine removed.

FRom what we have hitherto ſet down, may eaſily be anſwer'd ſeveral Quibbles, which *Dr. St.* & others, do, or may, object againſt the Doctrine above eſtabliſhed. The Doctor often inſinuates that there are two ſorts of Idolary. The one conſiſtent with the Being, but not with the Soundneſs of a Church: The other inconſiſtent with the very Being of a Church: and he makes the *Roman* Church guilty of the former kind of Idolatry, and not of the latter. Whence he concludes, that he does not commit any Contradiction by charging the *Roman* Church with this ſort of Idolatry, and yet granting her to be a true Church. But this objection vaniſhes to nothing; becauſe we have ſhewn, that the general notion of Idolatry, allowed by the Dr. is inconſiſtent with a *Fundamental*, and *Eſſential* point of Religion; and

and consequently with the very Being of a True Church. And since there can be no kind of Idolatry, which does not participate the general notion of Idolatry, as is evident, it manifestly follows, that all sorts possible of Idolatry are inconsistent with the Being of a Church.

Moreover, we have already demonstrated, that Dr. *St.* affirms, in the places quoted above, the Idolatry allowed of by the *Roman* Church to be as bad, nay worse, than the grossest Idolatry of the Heathens. Now if the grossest Idolatry of the Heathens be destructive to the Being of a Church, as certainly it is, (neither does, nor can Dr. *St.* deny it) how is it credible, that an Idolatry yet worse than that, should be consistent with the Being, and Essence of a True Church? The Dr. might as well, with the subtlety of his wit, distinguish two Antichrists; the one, that is contrary to Christ; the other, though worse than the former, that is not contrary to Christ, but his intimate Friend. For I am confident, that one may as easily find out an Antichrist, not contrary to Christ, as an Idolatry not dstructive to

the

the Being of a True Church. In the like manner he might ſay, (and therein he would highly oblige the Libertins of our Nation) that there are two ſorts of Debauchery, the one, inconſiſtent with a good life; the other, though far worſe than the former, yet conſiſtent with it: and then tells us, that one cannot be a good, and pious man, and yet a Debauchee in the former ſenſe; But that if one be a Debauchee in the latter ſenſe, (which is yet far more horrible, than the former) he may very well be a good and pious man, without the leaſt ſhew of Contradiction: and then laugh at us, as half-witted men, becauſe we cannot underſtand theſe Niceties.

Certainly, there has never been yet in the world a man, who has more obliged Idolaters, than Dr. *St.* has done. I, and many more with me, have alwayes believed, that there is no Idolatry, which is not Idolatry; and that all Idolatry is inconſiſtent with the Being of a True Church. But the incomparable Dr. *St.* has found out one Idolatry, that is no-Idolatry; another Idolatry, which kills a Church; another, though worſe

worſe than the former, that makes her only ſick; and another finally, that is an Eſſential perfection, and a neceſſary ingredient of a True Church; as we ſhall ſee, when we come to examin his Anſwer to our Appendix. Now ſince the Dr. has invented ſuch pretty kinds of Idolatry, who can blame him for making our Church, both True and Idolatrous?

Again the Dr. anſwers, (clear himſelf from Self-contradiction) that he never affirmed, the *Roman* Church did, or does teach in expreſs terms, any ſort of Idolatry, or that *the honour due only to God, may be given to a meer Creature.* But that ſhe only teaches thoſe things, wherein Idolatry lies: which is not to teach Idolatry expreſsly: as for inſtance, ſhe does not teach the Veneration ſhe exhibits to Images to be Idolatry, and yet lawful; for that would be to teach Idolatry in expreſs terms: but rather ſhe affirms the contrary, *viz.* That the forementioned Veneration is not Idolatrous: for ſhe thinks, that the honour ſhe exhibits to Images, is not Divine Worſhip: however, becauſe the Dr. will

will have her to be miſtaken in theſe perſwaſions, he impeaches her of Idolatry.

Now the Subſtance of this Anſwer comes to be, that although to ſay, that the *Roman* Church is a True Church, and yet that ſhe does teach Idolatry in expreſs terms, be a palpable Contradiction; yet there is no appearance of contradiction in ſaying, as he does, that the *Roman* Church is a True Church, but yet that ſhe does teach thoſe things wherein Idolatry lies; which are his words, *pag.* 29. or that ſhe does teach Idolatry, not in expreſs terms, but only by Conſequence, as he ſaies *pag.* 21.

But I leave to others to examin, how this does agree, with what Dr. *St.* affirms, in ſeveral places of his Diſcourſe concerning the Idolatry practiſed in the *Roman* Church: endeavouring to ſhew, that ſhe does expreſsly act againſt the *Second Commandment* of God, (according to their account) wherein is prohibited Idolatry) when ſhe teaches the Veneration, and Worſhip of Images.

Beſides, this objection is caſhiered, by what has been already diſcuſs'd. For ſince

ſince the Idolatry Dr. *St.* fathers upon the *Roman* Church is deſtructive to a Fundamental point of Religion, and conſequently to the very Being of a True Church, as has been already demonſtrated, 'tis impoſſible, that a Church, remaining a True Church, ſhould teach ſuch an Idolatry, either in expreſs terms, or by good Conſequence: and as the Dr. will not grant, that to teach Idolatry only by Conſequence, teaching thoſe things wherein it lies, is enough to free the *Roman* Church from being really Idolatrous; otherwiſe by this Anſwer he himſelf would diſcharge her from the Crime of Idolatry he caſts upon her; ſo neither can it excuſe the *Roman* Church from being no True Church; the oppoſiteneſs of Idolatry with the Eſſence of a Church, conſiſting in the Reality of the thing, and not in the particular perſwaſion of ſuch as teach it. Wherefore to ſay, that the *Roman* Church is a True Church, and yet that ſhe does teach Idolatry in the manner aforementioned, is to commit a palpable Contradiction.

Moreover, 'tis certain, neither can the Dr.

Dr. question it, that the Churches of the grosſeſt ſort of Heathens, did teach Idolatry, *deſtructive to the being of a true Church*, and in a manner deſtructive thereunto; and yet they did not teach Idolatry in expreſs terms, but only by Conſequence, teaching thoſe things wherein it did lie. For either they did affirm (though by miſtake) that the object, to which they gave Divine Worſhip, was not a meer Creature; or that the honour they gave, was not properly Divine. For what Heathen did ever teach in expreſs terms, That *the honour due only to God, may be given to a meer Creature?* So that were this objection of any force, it would excuſe the groſſeſt Heathens from practiſing, or teaching any Idolatry, deſtructive to the Eſſence of a True Church. Nay, if Idolatry, becauſe it is taught, not in expreſs terms, but by conſequence, is not deſtructive to the Being of a Church, he might alſo affirm, that upon the ſame account it is neither deſtructive to the ſoundneſs of it; and conſequently the *Roman* Church would not be, according to the Dr. 's opinion, not only True,

but Sound alſo. For if this Doctrine be true, the deſtructiveneſs of Idolatry is not to be taken from the thing, which is practiſed or taught, but from the manner of practſing it, or teaching it. All Hereſies, if they be truly ſuch, are deſtructive to the very Being of a True Church, becauſe they ſeparate the Societies that profeſs them, from the Church of Chriſt, as the very notion of Hereſie does import: yet according to this anſwer of the Doctor, they would be conſiſtent with the Eſſence of a True Church; becauſe there is no Heretical Church, which is not miſtaken in ſome thing that it teaches; or which does teach to be an Errour or Hereſie, that which ſhe maintains as a Truth: yet becauſe ſhe teaches thoſe things, wherein her particular Hereſie lies, and becauſe ſhe teaches to be true what really is an Errour, and an Errour contrary to an Article of Faith; therefore ſhe is an Heretical, and no True Church.

Whence it follows, that ſhould one affirm, that ſuch a Church is True, and yet that ſhe teaches thoſe things, wherein Hereſie, and Errour againſt Faith does

does lie, he would, beyond debate, contradict himself: and if it be a contradiction to affirm, that such a Church is true, and yet Heretical, will it be no Contradiction to defend, that the *Roman* Church is True, but yet Idolatrous? For certainly Idolatry is no less destructive to the Being of a Church, than Heresie.

Wherefore, as to kill a man, 'tis enough for one to do that, which necessarily infers the Separation of the Soul from the Body, whether he does it by mistake, or without mistake; knowingly, or not knowingly: So, to destroy the Being of a True Church, 'tis enough, if she teaches any Fundamental, or Essential Errour, destructive to the Essence thereof; as she must necessarily do, if she teaches Idolatry, whether she teaches it in expres terms, or only by consequence, whether by mistake or not: For although mistake may excuse him, who has it, from erring maliciously, yet not from erring, nor the Church that should teach such an Errour, from being Erroneous.

Since therefore Dr. *St.* does not excuse the *Roman* Church from Erring a-

gainſt this Fundamental point, *The Honour due only to God, is not to be given to a meer Creature*, he cannot excuſe her from a Fundamental Errour, inconſiſtent with the Being of a True Church; and conſequently he cannot excuſe himſelf from a manifeſt Contradiction, in granting the *Roman* Church to be a True Church, and yet charging her with Doctrines containing Idolatry.

After all theſe attempts, on the part of the Idolatry he fathers upon us, had proved unſucceſsful; he turns himſelf to the other part of the Contradiction, ſaying, that when he grants *the Roman Church to be a True Church*, he means thereby nothing elſe, but that *ſhe does embrace all Eſſential points of Faith, couched in the Antient Creeds of the Catholick Church*; and he thinks it very far from any contradiction, to affirm, that a Church may embrace all ſuch points, and yet teach Idolatry: and therefore he ſaies, that although the Church of *Rome* does own the Fundamentals of Chriſtian Faith contained in the Antient Creeds, yet ſhe debauches thoſe very Principles, which ſhe profeſſes to own,

pag.

pag. 34. This objection is also annulled, by what we have laid down above. First, Dr. *St.* does not only grant, that the *Roman* Church does embrace all the Essentials points of Christian Faith, and consequently amongst the rest this point, *viz. The Honour due only to God, is not to be given to a meer Creature*; which he confesses to be one of them: But also he allows, that she does not err against any Fundamental point of Faith: this being my Fifth Proposition; which he assents unto, and calls it his Concession. Now to say, That the *Roman* Church does not err against any Fundamental point, (as he saies she does not) and yet that she teaches Idolatry, (which is to err against a Fundamental point, even according to his Principles) is a palpable contradiction.

Secondly, When Dr. *St.* grants our Church to be a True Church, as he does, without doubt he takes a True Church as contradistinct from a False Church, or from a Church which is not True; otherwise he would interpret in a quite contrary sense this his Concession, *The Roman Church is a True Church*,

i. e. *The Roman Church is no true Church*; which interpretation cannot but ſeem to any prudent man very ridiculous. Now a Church may fail to be a True Church, either becauſe ſhe does not poſitively embrace ſome Eſſential point, or becauſe ſhe denies ſome Eſſential point, and errs againſt it; and to the Eſſence of a True Church it is requiſite, not only to embrace poſitively all Fundamental points, but alſo not to err againſt any one of them, as I have demonſtrated above. Neither do I think, that Dr. *St.* will deny it; otherwiſe he would, doubtleſs, have denyed our Fifth Propoſition. Whoever therefore affirms, that our Church is a True Church, and yet that it errs againſt a Fundamental point, (as neceſſarily it muſt, if it maintains Idolatry) does as much as affirm, it is True, and not True.

Thirdly, let's ſuppoſe, (ſince 'tis poſſible for a Church to contradict her ſelf) that a Church, embracing all the ancient Creeds, with the Articles contained in them, ſhould notwithſtanding contradict her ſelf, denying ſome of the main points couched in thoſe Creeds, and

own

owned by her, ſure Dr. *St.* will not ſay, that ſuch a Church is a True Church; and that by contradicting thoſe main Articles of Faith ſhe does only debauch them, but not ruine, or deſtroy them. Certainly every Contradictory ruins it Contradictory, and every Contrary deſtroys its Contrary. Will the Dr. affirm, that the groſſeſt of the Heathens Idolatry did only debauch, and not deſtroy, this Prindiple owned by them, *viz. The honour due only to God is not to be given to a meer Creature?* and after the Dr. has taken ſo much pains to ſhew, that the Veneration of Images, owned by the *Roman* Church, is point blank againſt their 2d Commandment, will he ſay now, it only debauches it, but does not deſtroy it? Wherefore Dr. *St.* cannot defend, that the *Roman* Church does teach Idolatry, without granting, that ſhe contradicts, and deſtroys a Fundamental point of Religion; neither can he grant, that ſhe contradicts a Fundamental point of Religion, and yet allow that ſhe is a True Church. So that to maintain on the one ſide that ſhe teaches Idolatry, and on the other,

that she is a True Church. is to commit a manifest Contradiction.

I insinuated in my Book the similitude of a way from one place to another, hinted at also by the Dr. *pag.* 50, which may contribute much to clear this matter. Suppose, as the custome is in some Almanacks, which set down the true waies from one place to another, one should describe a True way, how we may go from *London* to *York*; and setting down all the Towns, which others commonly mention, should intermingle them with other places, that lie either the quite contrary way, or at least quite out of the way; as for instance, from *Stamford*, (which lies in the ordinary way) to the *Fennes*; thence to *Salisbury*; thence to *Plimouth*; thence to the *West-Indies*, and if you please to *East-Indies* also: for you are alwayes in a true way from *London* to *York*; only with this general advice, that whensoever you go out of the true way, you must turn back again; without specifying which places are out of the way; which not: but setting them down all as parts of the True way. So that who-

ever

ever does not go through all the places, put down in the forementioned description, does not follow the way therein contained. Would not such a description of a True way from *London* to *York*, be extream ridiculous? could there be a better piece of Drollery than this, for *Poor Robins* Almanack? or can any man of common sense, knowing that so many places, set down in the aforesaid description, lie quite out of the way from *London* to *York*, call the way there described a True way from *London* to *York*? For certainly, whoever understand what he saies, must needs understand by a True way from *London* to *York*, a way, that not only contains all the principal places from the one City to the other, but moreover does not contain any place quite out of the way.

This is just our case with Dr. *St.* He freely confesses, that the *Roman* Church is a True Church, and a True way to Salvation; but withal he affirms, that she does not only contain those main points, which he thinks sufficient to constitute a True Church; but also other particular points, which he looks upon as

as gross Idolatry, and open Violations of the Divine Law; and consequently destructive to the Salvation of men: which particular points the *Roman* Church delivers, not as Errours, but as Truths, and Articles of Faith, which all are bound to assent unto. So that whoever denies any of those particular points, can no more be a *Roman* Catholick, than if he denyed some of the main points of Christianity, common both to Catholicks and Protestants. Now since Dr. *St.* is of this perswasion, that the *Roman* Church teaches and requires gross Idolatry, and open violations of Gods Laws, how can he say without manifestly contradicting himself, that notwithstanding all this, she is a True Church, and a True way to Heaven? Can a True way to Heaven be made up of a high way to Hell? as certainly Idolatry is: or is not Idolatry as far out of the way to Heaven, as the *West-Indies* is out of the way from *London* to *York*? The answer of the Dr. in effect is this. If you be a *Roman* Chatholick, you are in a True way to Heaven; and yet if you be a *Roman* Cathplick, you

are quite out of the way to Heaven: and whether this be not pure non-ſenſe, I leave it to the judgment of any impartial perſon whatſoever. Whence I conclude, that all men of Reſon muſt needs underſtand by a True Church, a Church that does not only poſitively embrace all thoſe points, and Articles, which are requiſite to the Being of a Church; but moreover does not teach, nor require any thing whatſoever deſtructive to Salvation; as doubtleſs groſs Idolatry, and open Violations of the Divine Laws, are.

As inſignificant and ſenſeleſs as this, is another evaſion, (or rather the ſame in other terms) the Dr. makes uſe of, *viz.* that we may be ſaved as Chriſtians, but not as *Roman* Catholicks; and that we may be ſaved, if we repent; but not otherwiſe. And what *Roman* Catholick did ever affirm, that Proteſtants, or any Hereticks whatſoever, are damned as Chriſtians; or becauſe they hold the general Principles of Chriſtianity, wherein they agree with good Chriſtians? but only as holding the particular Errours of their reſpective Religions: neither

neither will they be damned, if they Repent. And yet Dr. *St.* pretends, that Proteſtants have a more Charitable opinion of Catholicks, in order to their Salvation, than Catholicks have of Proteſtants. See my book, *pag.* 7, 8. Yea, there is no Religion, which does not hold ſome general Truths, *viz.* That *we ought to repent of our ſins, and retract our Errours; That we are bound to believe, and do whatſoever God will have us believe, or do,* and ſuch like: neither is any one damned for holding theſe Truths; nor if he ſincerely repents of all his ſins, and retracts all his errours: and yet ſure Dr. *St.* will not grant, that all Religions in the world are True, and the very ſame with Proteſtancy, as he ſaies ours is.

The forementioned Anſwer of Dr. *St.* puts me in mind of what one anſwered a Prince, who was alſo a Biſhop, when being checked by him for having committed ſome great miſdemeanour unbeſeeming a Biſhop, he ſaid, that *he had done it as a Prince, not as a Biſhop*; the other replyed, *But if the Devil carries away your Highneſs as a Prince, what will*

will become of you as a Bishop? In the like manner, if Dr. *St.* affirms, that *Roman* Catholicks, as such, are damned, can he imagin, that they will be saved as Christians? In fine, according to this answer of Dr. *St.* it is no more possible for *Roman* Catholicks to be saved, than for a man to become a Horse; which is altogether impossible. For the repugnancy that is, for a man to become a horse, is not grounded upon the *Generical Predicates*, wherin he agrees with a Horse; but upon his special difference: and Dr. *St.* confesses the particular Tenets of *Roman* Catholicks to be repugnant to Salvation; but not the general: and if this be the possibility of Salvation he grants us, and whereof he so much vapours, what Catholick ever denied it to Protestants? and to say, that we may be saved, if we repent of our particular Tenets, and recal them, (which we can never do without quitting the *Roman* Catholick Religion) is as much, as if he should say, that the *Roman* Catholick Religion is a true way to Salvation, but that it will never carry you thither, unless you

quit

quit it: which is, as I insinuated in the place above quoted, a pretty piece of Non-sense.

Whence we conclude, that, as Dr. *St.* to shew that the *Roman* Church may be Idolatrous, though True, forges an Idolatry, which is no Idolatry; so to prove that she may be a true Church, though Idolatrous, he feigns a true Church that is no true Church. And who can wonder now, that *Whitby* should stile Dr. *St.* a Prodigy of Ingenuity and Learning; since he has been able to invent such prodigious distinctions of a true Church, no true Church; and of an Idolatry, no Idolatry.

And hence by the way, I infer a thing of great comfort for *Roman* Catholicks, which is, that when they hear their Church impeached of Idolatry, in so many Ballads cryed through the streets, and in so many Pamphlets, that lie upon every Stationers Stall, there is no more meant by the Idolatry they accuse us of, than an Idolatry that is no Idolatry; or an Idolatry that is an essential perfection of the true Religion: and there is no great harm to be feared from such Idolatries as these. One

One thing there is, that I cannot but wonder at; which is, that ſince Dr. *St.* is ſo eminent in compoſing things, though never ſo oppoſite one to the other, the Anabaptiſts and Quakers did not chuſe him for Arbiter in their late Conteſts concerning Religion. For though the *Anabaptiſts* had proved the *Quakers* no *Chriſtians*, as they pretended; notwithſtanding the Dr. out of his immenſe charity, would have demonſtrated, that they were both ſtill of the very ſame Religion, not only among themſelves, but even with him alſo. For if he be able to bring to a compoſition things, that grin ſo much one at the other, as a True Church and an Idolatrous Church, even with the groſſeſt ſort of Idolatry, what will he not compoſe? and if he be ſo charitable as to make his own Church the very ſame in ſubſtance with an Idolatrous Church, why not alſo with a No Chriſtian Church? beſides, the Quakers and Anabaptiſts follow the very ſame Rule, whereby Dr. *St.* regulates Proteſtancy. See his Principles, 5, 13, 15. For after a ſober and ſincere enquiry made

made into the Truth, (and whether they have made such an enquiry or not, they must be their own Judges, without being bound to submit to any Exteriour Guide) they follow the *Light within*, or a *faculty in them of discerning Truth and Falshood, in matters proposed to their Belief*: whereby they *judge of the Truth of Divine Revelation*, and of the *Genuine sense thereof*. So that, if this faculty (which is, and ought to be, according to the Dr. *their sole Guide*) tells them, *That Christ is not God, That Christian Religion is not true, or that there is no Scripture*; All goes well, and they are of the very same Religion with Dr. *St.* adjusting themselves to his very rule. A late Book, entituled *A Treatise of Humane Reason*, disgusted much the Protestants as I have heard; and yet it is nothing else, but an abstract of those very *Principles* and *Grounds*, whereon this Champion of Protestancy, Dr. *St.* builds the Vindication of the Protestant Religion.

Finally, because the Dr. seems extream fond of his distinction of a True Church, and a Sound Church, insinuated

ted above, it will not be amiss to examin what he can mean by a Sound Church, and secure way to Salvation; which in this debate signifie the same. Does he mean by it a Church, that is free from all difficulties, and Temptations? if so, then there is no True Church in the world, that is sound and secure. For, even according to our Saviours Testimony, the true way to Heaven is narrow, and difficult, beset with several dangers, and temptations; which render the Salvation of men extream hazardous; and encompassed on all with cross and by-paths, and dark turnnings; wherein many are miss-led; yea Christian Religion, taken in its greatest purity, contains high Mysteries, not easie to be assented unto; and hard Precepts which go against the grain of our nature; and many miscarry, deterred by these difficulties. Does he therefore mean by it a Church qualified with such Laws, that whoever keeps close to them till death, (and let the way to Salvation be never so secure, yet if one does not keep to it 'till death, what will it avail him?) will certainly be saved. If this

be his meaning, there is no True Church which is not ſound and ſecure, in this ſenſe. For a True Church muſt contain all things neceſſary to Salvation, both in order to our Belief, and Practice, as is certain: neither does Dr. *St.* deny it: and ſure, whoever dies, having diſcharged all things neceſſary to his Salvation, as well in reference to his Belief, as Practice, will certainly be ſaved; as is manifeſt from thoſe words of our Saviour, *Si vis ad vitam ingredi, ſerva mandata*: which is a much as if he had ſaid, whoever obſerves my Commandments, ſhall certainly be ſaved: and doubtleſs no Body can do all, that is neceſſary to Salvation, without obſerving Gods Commandments.

Does he mean by it a Church, that does not teach any thing whatſoever, as an Article of Faith, which is either an Errour, or Corruption? This ſeems to be his meaning. But neither is it poſſible, that any Church whatſoever ſhould be a True Church, and yet not ſound, and ſecure in this ſenſe. For it is a manifeſt Contradiction to affirm, That ſuch a Church is a True Church, but

yet

yet that ſhe fathers upon God, or teaches God to be the Author of ſome Errour or Corruption; as neceſſarily ſhe muſt, if ſhe teaches any Errour or Corruption, as an Article of Faith. A True Church muſt not err againſt any Fundamental point of Faith, as is certain; nor conſequently, againſt this point, *God is not the Author of any Errour or Corruption whatſoever*: which, doubtleſs, is Fundamental. A true Church therefore muſt not teach any Errour or Corruption, as an Article of Faith; or (which is the ſame) muſt not teach God to be the Author of any Errour, or Corruption. For to teach this, is to err againſt the forementioned point.

Does he mean by it a Church, that does not require, or enjoyn, any Practice, or any other thing, deſtructive to Salvation; as doubtleſs all Idolatry is, whether ſhe teaches it as an Article of Faith, or not? But how can a Church be true, and yet not ſound nor ſecure, in this ſenſe alſo? A true Church muſt lead men to Salvation; and certainly it cannot lead men to Salvation, if it enjoyns, and requires them to do things

deſtructive thereunto. Wherefore I cannot ſee what Dr. *St.* is able to mean by a Sound and Secure Church; which does not prove, either that there is not in the world any Church True and Sound; or that there is no Church True which is not Sound, and ſecure: and we are ſo far from confounding a True Church with a Sound and Secure Church in the firſt ſenſe abovementioned; *i. e.* with a Church free from all dangers and difficulties, as Dr. *St.* will needs ſuppoſe we do, that we conſtantly affirm, that there is no True Church in the world, Sound and Secure in that ſenſe; according to what I ſet down in my Book, *pag.* 5. But the Dr. did not think fit to take notice thereof.

From what has been agitated in the precedent Diſcourſes, it manifeſtly appears, that Dr. *St.* is guilty of Self Contradiction, by aſſerting that the *Roman* Church is a True Church, and yet charging her with Idolatry, yea the groſſeſt Idolatry of the world: and as I promiſed at the beginning, I am willing to admit, as Judges in this plea, the Learned men in our two famous Univerſities.

CHAP.

CHAP. IX.

The Doctor's Anſwer to my Appendix, *proved Frivolous.*

I Come now to conſider, what Anſwer Dr. *St.* is pleaſed to afford to the *Appendix* of my Book; which he Attacks in the next place: wherein, to confirm the former Doctrine, concerning the Nullity of the Charge of Idolatry, caſt upon the *Roman* Church, I proved, that either his Principles, whereon he bottoms the forementioned Charge, were not good, or that he himſelf was an Idolater: and the greateſt part of his Anſwer, being contained in leſs than three leaves in Octavo, is ſtuffed up with Scoffs, gawdy expreſſions, jingling Metaphors, ſuperfluous Digreſſions, Railery, and ſuch like Chaff, the common Ingredients of his Books. After I had declared each premiſe by it ſelf, I ſummed up the ſubſtance of my Argument in this manner.

Whoever Worſhips God repreſented in a way far inferiour to his Great-

neſs, is an Idolater, according to Dr. *St.*'s main Principle; whereby he pretends to make good the Charge of Idolatry laid upon us in the Veneration of Images.

But whoever Worſhips God repreſented unto him without the Beatifical Viſion, either by Images, by words, or by Imagination, he worſhips God repreſented in a way far inferiour to his Greatneſs, as is manifeſt.

Therefore whoever Worſhips God, repreſented unto him without the Beatifical Viſion, either by Words or Images, or by his own Imagination, as is ding to Dr. *St.*'s Principles, is an Idolater: but Dr. *St.* does worſhip God repreſented unto him without the Beatifical Viſion, either by words, by Images, or his own Imaginations, as is evident, if he Worſhips God at all. Whence I conclude, that he is an Idolater, according to his own Conceſſions.

Now Dr. *St.* cannot deny the Conſequences, if he once grants the Premiſes: neither can he deny the Premiſes without eating his own words, or denying ſome manifeſt Principle. For, certainly he is not ſo wicked, as to conſeſs that he never Worſhips God; nor ſo Pha-

na-

natically pround, as to ſay, That he does enjoy the Beatifical Viſion. Whence it follows, that he muſt grant, that he Worſhips God repreſented unto him in ſome manner beneath the Beatifical Viſion. For it is certain, that all other Repreſentations of God, different from the Beatifical Viſion, muſt neceſſarily fall beneath it. Hence I infer, that all Repreſentations of God, excepting the Beatifical Viſion, (which is an Intuitive Knowledg of God) are inferiour to his Greatneſs. For all ſuch Repreſentations, as the Apoſtle teaches us, are *Enigmatical*, and *per ſpeculum*, not repreſenting God, on the part of the object, *ſicuti eſt*, as he is, but (as Scholaſtical Divines term them) *inadequate* and *abſtractive*, *per ſpecies alienas*, by *Idea's* alien, and far eſtranged from the Nature of God; and conſequently, infinitely beneath his Greatneſs. For whatſoever is not God, muſt neceſſarily be infinitely beneath him. Since therefore all Repreſentations of God not as he is, but by alien Species, and Idea's (ſuch are all Repreſentations of God by words, by Images, or by abſtractive, and imperfect Imaginations) are far

inferiour to his Greatneſs, and Majeſty; it is manifeſtly inferred, that whoever Worſhips God, repreſented unto him in either of the forementioned manners, muſt needs worſhip him repreſented in a way far inferiour to his Greatneſs. Neither does Dr. *St.* in his Anſwer to this point, any where refute this Doctrine; but rather confirms it, confeſſing plainly, *pag.* 39. *That his Conceptions cannot reach the Greatneſs of God*; and he would be a Fanatick ſhould he aſſert the contrary. Now ſince Dr. *St.* worſhips God repreſented unto him by his own Conceptions, theſe remaining far beneath his Greatneſs, we conclud that Dr. *St.* worſhips God repreſented unto him in a way inferiour to his Grandeur, and Majeſty. Wherefore, to ſave himſelf from being an Idolater, he muſt neceſſarily deny this Principle to be true, *viz. Whoever worſhips God, repreſented unto him in a way inferiour to his Greatneſs, is an Idolater.* Yet this is the main Principle, whereon he grounds the Charge of Idolatry, caſt upon the *Roman* Church, in the Veneration of Images: and hence is manifeſtly proved,

that

that the aforeſaid Charge, as bottomed upon a falſe and Sandy Principle, is altogether groundleſs, and frivolous: which was what I intended by this Appendix, made in confirmation of what I had laid down before, to prove our Church guitleſs of Idolatry.

Let's now examin, what Artifices the Dr. uſes, to clear himſelf from this imputation of Idolatry, drawn up againſt him out of his own Principles, and to *prevent the Train* (as he ſaies *pag.* 35.) *laid to blow him up, fetch'd from his own Stores.* Firſt, he ſeems to have been inclined to ſuſpect, that this Charge of Idolatry caſt upon him, *was intended only for a piece of Drollery.* This is a pretty way to ſtave off all Arguments *ab abſurdo*; which are very concluding, and frequent among Learned men; when to prove the inanity of ſome Principle produced by the Adverſary, they lay open the abſurdities which thence enſue. A compendious Anſwering to all ſuch Arguments, according to this incomparable Doctors way of anſwering, is to tell thoſe who frame them, *That they are in jeſt*, and that *without doubt they intend only*

only to Droll. But if this manner of Answering be warrantable, 'twill be sufficient to tell Dr. *St.* That his whole Discourse of Idolatry, and Fanaticism, charged upon the *Roman* Church, and almost all his other works, were intended only for pieces of Drollery. A person of Quality, and no *Roman-Catholick*, could find no fitter place in his Library for Dr. *St.*'s Discourse of the *Roman* Idolatry, than to put it among the Play-books.

After this, to annul the aforesaid Charge of Idolatry, he betakes himself to admiration. *What*, saies he, *pag.* 35. *is it come to this at last?* and *am I become an Idolater too, who was never apt to think my self inclined so much as to Superstition?* I marry Sir, This is a speedy way indeed to dispatch Arguments, with no more than an Admiration. What! Dr. *Stillingfleet* and Idolater? Dr. *Stillingfleet*, that Zealous man for Religion? who knows not how to defend his own Church to be True, without laying down Principles, that prove all Churches, never so Heretical, or Schismatical, to be true, and Orthodox. Dr.

Stilling-

Stillingfleet, that pious and godly Proteſtant! who has ſo great a kindneſs for the Proteſtant Church, that he makes her the very ſame with an Idolatrous Church, and with ſuch a kind of Idolatry, that is worſe *than the adoring a red Cloath for God!* Dr. *Stillingfleet*, ſo Religious a man, thatby all we can gueſs by his Principles alledged above, we cannot determin, whether he be of any, or of no Religion! What, ſuch a man as this, an Idolater! no, God forbid. And why? Becauſe (forſooth) *he was never apt to think himſelf inclined that way.* Excellent! juſt as if one ſhould ſay, The Heathens did not think themſelves Idolatrous, nor inclined that way: Therefore they were no Idolaters. I wonder, why Dr. *St.* who boaſts ſo much of his Charity, does not go to *Newgate* to inſtruct the Malefactors there, how they may defend themſelves, when they are Arraigned for Thieves, or Murderers; telling them with one ſole Exclamation, they may invalidate all the Evidences brought in againſt them. *What, They, Thieves? They, Murderers? They, take away mens Goods, and Lives too? who were*

were never apt to think themſelves inclined but to works of Piety? and as coming inſtructed by ſo good an Advocate, they would, doubtleſs, be inſtantly diſcharged.

But if this be the Champion of the *Engliſh* Church, as he is cryed up to be, ſhe is in as miſerable a condition, any of her Enemies con wiſh her. Such Defenders as theſe, have brought the *Engliſh* Proteſtancy ſo low, that 'tis no wonder they ſhould in every Seſſion of Parliament give her a Cordial to keep her alive. Such Miniſters contribute far more to the ruine of Proteſtancy, than any *Roman* Prieſts. Yea, if this manner of anſwering be ſolid, it follows alſo, that the Charges of Idolatry, and Fanaticiſme, wherewith he impeaches our Church, are without difficulty repealed, ſaying only, *What, The Church of Rome Idolatrous! That Church, which has baniſhed Paganiſme from the greateſt part of the World! Should ſhe introduce an Idolatry more deteſtable, than the groſſeſt Idolatry of the Pagans! That Church, which even Proteſtants themſelves confeſs, to have been the only viſible Church of Chriſt,*

for

for above 1000 *years, and acknowledge her to be the Mother Church, the Patriarchal Church of the Weſt, the firſt See,* prima Sedes, *a true Member at leaſt of the Catholick Church, unerring in all Articles of Faith, the very ſame with their own Church; from whom they pretend to derive the Ordination of their Biſhops, and by whom have been handed down to them the Books of Scripture; upon which alone they ground their Religion: that ſuch a Church, and acknowledged as ſuch, ſhould be impeached by Proteſtants, and among the reſt by Dr.* St. *who in moſt things agrees to the former Character given of her: Should, I ſay, be impeached of an Iddolatry more deteſtable, than the Adoration of an Animal, a Statue, or a red Cloth, for God; is indeed a thing worthy of Admiration, and whereof ſeveral moderate Proteſtants are aſhamed.* But why ſhould any one wonder, that Dr. *Stillingfleet* (Dr. *Stillingfleet* I ſay) ſhould be an Idolater; and only becauſe *he was never apt to think himſelf inclined that way?* Although I never abſolutely accuſed him of Idolatry; but only on ſuppoſition, that the Principles whereon he pretends to eſtabliſh

eſtabliſh the Charge of Idolatry caſt upon us, were warrantable: which is very different, as preſently ſhall be made to appear.

He goes on, and ſaies (*pag.* 53.) *That all the comfort he found left, was towards the concluſion of my Book*; wherein, as he affirms, I confeſs, *That the ſame Argument proves the Prophets, Evangeliſts, and the Holy Ghoſt himſelf, to be Idolaters*: and then he adds, *that he hoped there was no great harm to be feared in ſo good Company*. But Dr. *St.* very diſingenuoſly leaves out this Clauſe contained in my Book, *viz. or it proves nothing*: which renders the ſenſe very different ſcom what thoſe words, as quoted by the Dr. may ſeem to import. For ſure he will not deny, but that it is a very different thing to ſay abſolutely, Dr. *St. is an Hypocrite*, without adding any thing more, or to ſay, Dr. *St. is an Hypocrite, if he holds one Religion in his heart, and profeſſes another exteriourly*. Now my intent was, by diſcovering the vaſt abſurdities, which wait upon Dr. *St.*'s Argument, whereby he pretends to prove *Roman* Catholicks guilty of I-

do-

dolatry, to ſhew the inanity, and nullity thereof, according to that irrefragable Maxime of *Rational Diſcourſes*, *Out of Truth alone neither Falſity, nor Abſurdity does follow*: and becauſe perhaps ſome might not think it any abſurdity to grant, that Dr. *St.* is an Idolater; and conſequently, admitting it, might ſtick to his Argument, I added, *that the ſame Argument of the Dr. had it any force in it, would prove the Evangeliſts, and the Holy Ghoſt to be Idolaters*: an abſurdity ſo great, that no Chriſtian can aſſent unto: and when we argue *ab abſurdo*, the greater, and more evident the abſurdity, we infer, is, the better is the Argument. So that my Diſcourſe runs thus:

Either Dr. *St.*'s Argument proves the Evangeliſts, and Holy Ghoſt, to be Idolaters, or it proves nothing; as I have ſhewen throughout that Appendix.

But it does not, nor cannot prove, the Evangeliſts, and the Holy Ghoſt to be Idolaters. For certainly there can be no good proof of a Falſity, or Abſurdity:

Therefore his Argument proves nothing.

When

When ſhall we find any thing in the Dr. that looks like a rational Anſwer to this Charge of Idolatry, which lies ſo heavy upon him, out of his own Tenets? He ſaies (*pag.* 37.) *That God did forbid, in the Commandment, the worſhip of him by Images; but not the worſhip of him by our Conceptions*, although *unſuitable to his incomprehenſible nature*; without taking any notice of what I objected to the contrary: for *pag.* 19. I affirmed, that the Dr. himſelf, *pag.* 59. in his Diſcourſe concerning the *Roman* Idolatry, did underſtand the prohibition contained in the Commandment, of *all kind of Similitudes, or Repreſentations whatſoever, whether of a real, or imaginary Being*. For the words of the Law being general, all ſorts of Repreſentations, or Likeneſſes of God are neceſſarily comprehended therein. Now, not only Corporeal Images, but alſo Words and Conceptions, are certain Repretations, and Reſemblances of their objects: which Dr. *St.* never denied. Yea Knowledge, or Mental Conception, is commonly defined a Formal Repreſentation of an Object; and it is an ordina-

ordinary opinion among Philoſophers, that in obſcure, and abſtract Conceptions, the mind frames an Idea of the Object. And certainly ſhould one adore his own thonghts, and Idea's, he would commit Idolatry, and tranſgreſs this Commandment. Wherefore this Commandment does forbid the making any Image, or Repreſentation of God, whether Spiritual, or Corporeal; not abſolutely; but as the Law ſaies, to adore it. Since therefore, as Dr. *St.* confeſſes in his former book, and the Reaſons now alledged do evince, the Law ſpeaks of all kinds of Repreſentations, and Reſemblances, in order to that effect, why does he, in his Anſwer to my Book, confine the Law only to Corporeal Repreſentations?

Again, if according to the Dictates of Nature, (as Dr. *St.* affirms. *pag.* 36. who therefore thinks this commandment to be of an unalterable Nature, common to all, and not peculiar to the Jews) 'tis Idolatry to repreſent God by Corporeal Images, or to adore him ſo repreſented; becauſe Corporeal things repreſent God in a way far beneath

neath his Greatneſs, (which is the reaſon he produces for the Law) it follows evidently, that whoever adores God repreſented unto him in a way beneath his Greatneſs, whether by words, Images, or groſs Imaginations; (for neither of theſe waies do repreſent him in a manner ſuitable to his Majeſty, and there are unworthy Conceptions of God, as well as unworthy Images) is an Idolater: which is, what I intended to prove againſt him. For in natural Precepts (ſuch as this is) the Law extends as far as the Reaſon of the Law; and according to the conſtant Axiome of Logicians, *Cauſalis vera infert univerſalem veram.* If the Propoſition, which contains the cauſe, or reaſon of a thing be true, there follows neceſſarily an univerſal Truth. Wherefore if this Propoſition, who adores God repreſented by Corporeal things is an Idolater, becauſe he adores him repreſented in a way inferiour to his Greatneſs, be true, as Dr. *St.* will needs have it to be, this Univerſal muſt alſo be true, *Whoever adores God, repreſented in a way inferiour to his greatneſs, is an Idolater.* But the Dr. thought it

it best not to take any notice at all of these things: and I find, that among many other his rare accomplishments, one is, that he is excellent in forgetting such things, as he knows he cannot answer.

In the same page he will seem to lay in the dust my whole Discourse, with these only words: *But the mischief is, all this subtilety* (of my Argument) *is used against the Law-maker, and not against me.* O Irrefragable Answer! if such Answers as these will serve the turn, I'le warrant you the Dr. will never be puzzled. Let any one interpret the Law of God never so ridiculously, if he be urged with the Absurdities, that flow from such an Interpretation, his answer may be according to this learned Dr. when he hath nothing else to say, That *all the Absurdities they pretend to draw from his Interpretation, are against the Law-maker, and not against him.* Here occurs unto me, what I have lately read in a brief account of the most material passages between the Quakers and the Baptists, at the *Barbican* Meeting, *London, October* 9. 1674. *pag.* 9,

10. *The Anabaptiſt preſs'd the Quaker in this manner: the Apoſtle ſaith,* Let Women be ſilent in the Church. *Why ſuffer ye Women to declare? The Quaker anſwered, The Woman to be ſilenced, is* the Fleſh. *Has the Fleſh, replies the Anabaptiſt, a Husband? Yea, ſaies the Quaker: and who is it, replyed again the Anabaptiſt. the Quaker promptly anſwered,* The Devil. *But the Anabaptiſt goes on, and urges, The Text ſaith,* Let a Woman ask her Husband at home; *muſt the Fleſh be inſtructed by the Devil in matters of Religion?* Here the poor Quaker ſeemed, according to this account, to be puzzled. But had Dr. *St.* been by him, he would have ſuggeſted to him this eaſie anſwer. *Alas for thee! Thou canſt not underſtand. All thy ſubtlety is againſt* Paul, *and not againſt me.*

The debate between us and Dr. *St.* is concerning the right meaning of Gods Commandment. The Dr. ſaies, that thereby are prohibited *all Repreſentations of God, in a way inferiour to his Greatneſs, and the Adoring of him ſo Repreſented.* And after I had ſhewn out of undeniable Principles the abſurdity of this inter-

interpretation, can the Dr. think it a ſufficient anſwer to ſay, *All this ſubtlety is againſt the Law maker, and not againſt him?* Whenas all the Abſurdities I deduce, are againſt Dr. *St.*'s interpretation of the Law, not againſt the Law it ſelf, nor the Law-maker.

In the *pag.* 38. he ſeems to place the difference between Thoughts of God, and Corporeal Images of him, in order to our preſent deſign, That the former proceeds from the neceſſary weakneſs of our underſtanding, not being able to reach the Greatneſs of God; who therefore has procured by ſeveral waies, to prevent the errour of our Imaginations. But the latter are voluntary. This difference, or diſparity, is very inſignificant. For, as it proceeds from the neceſſary weakneſs of a mans underſtanding, that we cannot repreſent God in our Conceptions and Imaginations, but in a way far beneath his Greatneſs: ſo it proceeds alſo from the neceſſary weakneſs of all humane Art, and Learning, that we cannot repreſent him either by Words, or Corporeal Images, but in a manner very unſuitable to his Majeſty.

And as I have insinuated several times, 'tis certain, that there are as unhandsome, and unworthy Representations of God, and as far beneath his Greatness, in Imaginations, and in words, as in Corporeal Images. For what are Images, or Pictures, as I hinted *pag.* 29. but mens conceptions, and Idea's either cut out in Stone, or set down in Colours? And as God does procure to prevent the Errours of our Imaginations relating to him, by securing us, that he is far greater, than we can imagin; so he does procure in like manner, to prevent the Errours in our Words, and Images concerning God, by securing us, that he is far greater, than he can be expreſt, either by Words, or Images.

Moreover, if the Dr. underſtands, (for neither he himſelf ſeems to know what he would be at) by the difference aſſigned here by him, that we may chuſe whether we will make Corporeal Images of God, or not; but we cannot chuſe but think of God; and by conſequence, Thoughts of God are neceſſary: but Corporeal Images of God are voluntary; Then I reply, that this diſpa-

diſparity dos not ſolve the difficulty, concerning the expreſſion, or repreſentation of God in words; which is as voluntary unto us, as the repreſentations of him in Images. And yet Dr. *St.* will not ſay, either that we cannot ſpeak of God without committing Idolatry; or that we are able to expreſs in words his ineffable Majeſty, as it deſerves to be expreſſed.

Again many times to think of God is, in ſome manner, free unto us; becauſe it is free unto us, whether we will hear Sermons, read Books, and recite Prayers, wherein ſeveral expreſſions of God are contained; and conſequently they excite in us Thoughts of God, as repreſented by them. And although the firſt Thought of God be not free unto us, yet the continuation thereof is ſo: nay ſometimes Corporeal Pictures of God occur unto us, when by chance we light upon them, without more freedome on our part, then the Thoughts of God: ſo that were there no other diſparity, than what the Dr. here hints at, 'twould in that caſe be no leſs Idolatry to adore God repreſented by our Ima-

ginations, than by Corporeal Images.

Another disparity he insinuates, is, *That our Conceptions, although they reach not the Greatness of God, yet they are Spiritual Representations of his Nature; but Images are Corporeal Resemblances; and it is a great disparagement to God, to bring him down to the meanness of a Corporeal Image.* This answer is also very frivolous. First, because words are Corporeal Representations; yet it is no Idolatry to adore God as represented unto us in the words of Scripture. Neither will Dr. *St.* dare to affirm the contrary, although by such words, God be represented unto us in the same, or like manner, as he is represented in a Picture, *viz.* with Hands, Arms, Mouth, Sitting, and with such like Corporeal Expressions. Secondly, because, since our Conceptions do not reach the Greatness of God, we cannot think of God without abasing him, and bringing him down to the Meanness of our thoughts. Seeing therefore, that according to Dr. *St.*'s Sentiment, it is Idolatry to represent God by Corporeal Images, because they cannot reach his Greatness, but

ne-

neceſſarily bring him down to mean Expreſſions; upon the ſame account it would be Idolatry to repreſent him by our Conceptions; and the difference, if any, would only be, that the former is ſomewhat groſſer, than the latter. Thirdly, to adore as God any Creature, whether Spiritual, as an Angel, or the Devil, or Corporeal, as an Animal or Statue, is flat Idolatry; neither the difference of Spiritual, or Corporeal, can ſave the one from being Idolatry, and not the other: and it would be very abſurd to ſay, that to adore the Devil as God is not Idolatry, becauſe the Divil is a Spirit; but to adore the Sun, as God, is Idolatry, becauſe the Sun is a Body. Wherefore in the like manner there can be no reaſon to affirm, that the Adoration of God by our Conceptions is not Idolatry; but that the Adoration of God by Images is, becauſe theſe are Corporeal, but thoſe are Spiritual.

Finally he anſwers, *pag.* 38. That he had never ſuch an *Imagination* of God, as to *apprehend him like an old man ſitting in Heaven*; that he has no other Conception of God; *but of a Being infinitely perfect.*

perfect. But with the Dr.'s leave, unleſs he enjoyes the Beatifical Viſion of God, & ſees God face to face, *(facie ad faciem)* which we have no reaſon to believe he does, the Knowledge, and Conception, he frames of God, muſt neceſſarily be Enigmatical, as the Scripture terms it, and Abſtractive; and conſequently by the Species, and Similitude of Things far eſtranged from God: whether of *an old man ſitting in Heaven*, or of ſome other object it matters little: Becauſe whatever is not God, is infinitely beneath him. Beſides, when Dr. *St.* recites his Creed, with attention to what the words ſignifie, he muſt needs conceive God by the Species, or Similitude of one, who has a right hand, when he pronounces thoſe words, *Sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris Omnipotentis*, and it is an intolerable arrogance in Dr. *St.* to ſcorn, as it ſeems he does, to conceive God, as he is repreſented unto us in ſeveral places of Scripture, under Corporeal Similitudes; and as the Prophets themſelves, who writ thoſe Books, conceived him: their words being expreſſions of their Thoughts and Conceptions.

More-

Moreover, I desire to know from Dr. *St.* whether he ever lifts up his heart, and Adores Christ, as he conceives him in Heaven, or not. If not, 'tis no wonder he should not dare to Adore Christ in the Eucharist for fear of committing Idolatry; whenas upon the same account he dares not Adore him in Heaven. If so, can the Dr. imagin, that he conceives Christ in Heaven, as really he is there, with that Glory, Majesty, and Beauty, which neither *eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor the heart of man has been able to comprehend?* Is not the Conception he has of Christ in Heaven, like to some Pictures we have of our Saviour in Glory; which are only fancies of the Painter? And if he cannot conceive the Humanity of our Saviour, as he is in Heaven, much less his Divinity. Wherefore he must Adore Christ in Heaven, if ever he Adores him, considered in a manner far beneath his Greatness.

Neither do we deny God to be a Being infinitely Perfect: which is the notion of God. Yet this does not hinder, but that such an Infinite Being may be

be conceived by men under the Species, or Similitude, of ſome Corporeal Subſtance; as we all confeſs, that an Angel is a meer Spiritual ſubſtance; yet we conceive, and paint an Angel under the Species of a young man with wings on his ſhoulders; when as in reality ſuch a man is neither an Angel, nor has any Phyſical likeneſs, unleſs it be very remote, with him. Yet ſuch a Picture, or Idea, is commonly taken to ſignifie an Angel.

And here 'tis neceſſary to advertiſe, what Dr. *St.* will not ſeem to reflect on, That it is a very different thing, to take ſuch a Statue, Picture, Enigma, or Embleme, to ſignifie ſuch an object, and to take ſuch a Statue, Picture, Enigma, or Embleme, to be the very object it ſelf, or very like thereunto. In the City of *London* are put up three Statues of Women, with ſuch Attirement, to ſignifie Faith, Hope, and Charity; with whom they have no likeneſs at all: ſo that thoſe Statues are taken by the Citizens to ſignifie thoſe Vertues, and to put them in mind of them. But ſure Dr. *St.* will not ſay, that the Citizens of

Lon-

London are ſo ſilly, as to take Faith, Hope, and Charity, to be really three Women in ſuch a Dreſs; or that they have any real likeneſs, unleſs very remote, with them. The ſame is to be ſeen in all Emblems, and Hieroglyphicks; which are taken to ſignifie things very different. So a Ring is an Emblem of Eternity: But who does think that Eternity is a Ring?

In the like manner to take God to be really *an old man ſitting in Heaven*, with Hands, Arms, Mouth and Feet, or to have a great likeneſs with him, would, beyond queſtion be very diſhonourable unto God, and unworthy of him; but to take the Idea, or Picture of an *Old man ſitting in Heaven* (*Antiquus Dierum*) as God is deſcribed by the Prophet) or ſome other Corporeal Hieroglyphick, contained in the Apocalypſe, or other places of Scripture, to ſignifie, and repreſent unto us God, a *Being infinitely Perfect*, is by no means diſhonorable, or injurious unto him: otherwiſe the Prophets and Evangeliſts would be to blame for repreſenting him under ſuch Idea's or Expreſſions. Neither are

the

the Pictures of God more obnoxious to the miſtakes of vulgar people, then the like expreſſions by words, contained in the Creed and Scripture, as I inſinuated in my Book. But the Dr. thought good to paſs it over. Wherefore if Dr. *St.* has a more ſubtilized manner of conceiving the Divine Eſſence, than the Prophets, and Apoſtles had, he may keep it to himſelf: we, poor men, ſhall content our ſelves to conceive God as the Apoſtles and Prophets repreſent him in the Creed and Scripture.

From what hitherto has been diſcuſt, in relation to this point, it evidently appears, that either Dr. *St.* muſt grant himſelf; and if that be not abſurdity great enough, the Apoſtles, Evangeliſts, and the Holy Ghoſt, to be Idolaters; or confeſs, that the main Principle, whereon he pretends to make good the Charge of Idolatry, laid upon us in the Venetation of Images; to be frivolous, and inſignificant: which is what we aim at. But ſuch is the obſtinacy of ſome men, that to maintain one folly, they will run into a thouſand; and they will be ſure to do their work, whatever comes

comes of it. Dr. *St.* ſeems to be ſo Complaiſant, that to the end we may be Idolaters, he is willing to bear us company, and to be an Idolater himſelf, and to bring with him too the Prophets and Evangelifts: and *what harm is there to be feared in ſo good Company?*

Yea, the way he takes to prove us guilty of Idolatry in the Veneration of Images either is a meer dream, or it ſhews, there is *no Church in the world*, though never ſo Orthodox, Pure, and Sound, which does not require Idolatry. For all Churches require, that we ſhould adore God, and as *repreſented to us in this life.* Since therefore, according to the ordinary Providence, we cannot repreſent God in this life, *as he is*, but in a manner *far inferiour to his Greatneſs*, it follows manifeſtly, that all Churches, and all Religions, though never ſo Pure, and Sound, require, we ſhould Adore God, repreſented unto us, in a way *far inferiour to his Majeſty:* which according to Dr. *St.* is flat Idolatry. So that the Dr. to be ſure to perſwade his Devotes to be no *Roman-Catholicks*, he perſwades them to be of no Religion; or, which

is

is the ſame, deters them from that, which is *Eſſential to all Religions*; as is the Adoration of God, repreſented in a manner *inferiour to his Greatneſs*: and as to prove *Roman-Catholicks*, Idolaters in the Veneration of God by Images, he proves himſelf, the Prophets, and Evangeliſts; and all perſons whatſoever, that profeſs any Religion, to be likewiſe Idolaters; ſo to ſhew us guilty of the ſame Crime in the Adoration of the Euchariſt, (which is the groſſeſt Idolatry he Fathers upon us) he muſt declare as Complices, the Lutherans, who admit the *Real Preſence*, and Adore Chriſt in the Euchariſt, as we do: and what good Reformers of the *Roman* Church were the Lutherans, (and yet as ſuch they are look'd upon by *Engliſh* Proteſtants) if they left her depraved with a more deteſtable ſort of Idolatry, in the Dr.'s perſwaſion, than is the *Adoring of a Red Cloath for God*. But ſuch is Dr. *St.*'s Zeal. So that *Roman-Catholicks* be Idolaters, whoever elſe be ſo, he cares not. Friends or Foes, 'tis all one to him. It is to affront the Dr. to imagin, that a man of his Employments has leiſure,

to

to consider the vast absurdities, that flow from what he maintains.

And, to use the same words I set down in the Appendix, *pag.* 21. I infer, and conclude hence, *how little account is to be made of the Charge of Idolatry laid upon the* Roman *Church by Dr.* St. *seeing that the very same Principles, whereby he pretends to prove, that* Roman-Catholicks *are Idolaters, do prove, or they prove nothing, (as is most certain: for an Argument, that proves too much, proves nothing) that the Prophets, the Evangelists, and the Holy Ghost, are Idolaters. And if in this main point of Idolatry, which he pretends to make manifest, and undeniable against us, he does err so Sacrilegiously, and so Enormously, may we not prudently think that the other Charges, of leſser moment, which he laies upon the* Roman *Church, and wherein he does not pretend to so great an Evidence, are meer Whimsies, and malicious Calumnies?*

CHAP. X.

Concerning the other Contradictions committed by the Dr. in the Charges he lays upon the Roman *Church.*

MY deſign at the beginning was, to purſue in particular the other Contradictions, wherewith I charge the Dr, But what hitherto has been ſet down is ſufficient. Firſt, becauſe I have manifeſtly convicted him of Self-contradiction, in aſſerting the *Roman* Church to be a True Church, and yet Idolatrous, with the groſſeſt Idolatry: and ſince the main aſperſion he caſts upon us is this of Idolatry, (which therefore he terms the *Mouth of the Dragon*) if he can clear himſelf from Self-Contradiction in this point, we are willing to declare him free from that imputation in the other points, mentioned in my Book.

Secondly, Becauſe we have ſeen, That the Dr. does confeſſedly grant the *Roman* Church to be a True way to Heaven,

Heaven, a True Church, unerring in all Articles of Faith: and hence follows (as already we have evidenced) that ſhe teaches nothing as an Article of Faith, which is either a Falſity, or Corruption: and that ſhe neither requires, nor approves of any thing deſtructive to Salvation. And yet after all this, Dr. *St.* maintains, that the *Roman* Church teaches, and requires Damnable Errours, and groſs Violations of Gods Laws: which doubtleſs are deſtructive to Salvation: and herein, according to his Aſperſion, conſiſts the danger of Salvation, in living and dying in the Communion of the *Roman* Church: That ſhe teaches and allows of particular Enthuſiaſms, contrary to the Law of God, and countenances Rebellion, contrary to the Duty, due to Lawful Superiours; which Duty is an Article of Divine Faith. And herein he conſtitutes the pretended Fanaticiſme of the *Roman* Church: and finally that ſhe teaches and countenances Diviſions in matters of Faith: which ſhe cannot do without countenancing Hereſies, and Errours againſt Articles of Faith. Whence I con-

clude, that Dr. *St.* palpably contradicts himſelf, by granting the *Roman* Church to be a True Church, and yet charging her with danger of Salvation in her Communion, Fanaticiſme, and Diviſions in matters of Faith.

Thirdly, becauſe one notorious Contradiction being evidenced againſt any perſon, is enough to overthrow all his authority, and credit, and to vacate, conſequently all the Arguments which depend upon his Authority, and Faithfulneſs, as the Dr. himſelf confeſſes. Since therefore Dr. *St.* ſtands convicted of a palpable Self contradiction in a matter of ſo great a moment, as is the Charge of Idolatry layed to the *Roman* Church; and ſince the other Charges above mentioned depend upon his credit, and faithfulneſs in the Quotations he produces out of our Authors, and whereon he grounds ſuch Charges, we infer, that the aforeſaid Charges are Null, till he has wiped off the Self-contradiction, whereof he is Convicted; or at leaſt till thoſe, who peruſe his Books, have found out, that his Quotations are faithful, and effectual to his purpoſe.

I have read not long ſince, in the *Catholick Apology* (Third Edition) the Right Honourable Author whereof has handled all matters of Fact objected againſt us, ſo accurately, and perſpicuouſly, that whoever is not reſolved to be obſtinate, cannot but remain ſatisfied: I have read (I ſay) in that elaborate Book, *pag.* 269. *What* Gondamour *obſerved in one of his Letters to* Olivarez. *He ſaies, that being out of curioſity once with King* James *at Chappel, he perceived the Auditory extreamly attentive to their Miniſter; yet neverthelesſ they would not (he found) truſt him a whit. For no ſooner had he cited a place of Scripture, but they all ran to their Bibles, to ſee whether it were ſo, or not.* Now if Proteſtants will not truſt their Miniſters, and are taught even by the Miniſters themſelves, not to truſt them, when they quote, or rather read places out of their Bible which they have before them; citing the Book, the Chapter, and the Verſe; and when every one, or at leaſt the greateſt part of the Auditory, have their Bible with them; ſo that if the Miniſter ſhould forge any

thing, or be mistaken in the least kind, his forgery, or mistake would presently be discovered, to his Eternal disgrace, for forging, or mistaking, Gods own word, and not the word of men. If, I say, even in these Circumstances, where there is so little reason to suspect any forgerie, or mistake, they are taught not to trust their own Ministers, why should they trust them in the Allegations against the *Roman-Catholicks*, till themselves have found out, that what they alledge against us, is, as they alledge? when many times the Minister does not so much as name the Author for the thing he quotes; or names the Author, but not the Book, or the page; when he has not the Author before him, nor (perchance) has ever seen him: but what he quotes, he has received at a second or third hand; or if he has seen him, it has been only perfunctoriously; or a long time since, and so he may have forgotten the words; when none of the Auditory have the Book with them; nor (in any times) know where to find it; nor, if they find it (perhaps) most of them do not understand the Lan-

Language, wherein it is written; ſo that the forgery, or miſtake, if there be any, is not eaſily detected; and at moſt is a forgery, or miſtake, in the word of man, not of God? ſhould the Proteſtants obſerve only this rule, (which they are taught by their own Miniſters) even in Circumſtances, where there is ſuſpicion of ſome forgery or miſtake, *viz.* not to truſt them, but to ſuſpend their Judgment, till they have conſulted the books themſelves, and find, that what their Miniſters alledge, is true; moſt of the Calumnies urged againſt us, would vaniſh to nothing: and if this is to be obſerved with other Miniſters, even according to their own Doctrine, much more with Dr. *St.* who by ſtanding convicted of Self-contradiction has forfeited all his Authority, and Credit.

The Dr. ſeems very fond of his Treatiſe concerning the Fanaticiſme of the *Roman* Church; wherefore 'twill not be amiſs to add ſomething in particular, in reference to this point. He ſaies, *pag.* 51. That to prove, that Fanaticiſme does neceſſarily contain a Reſiſtance againſt Authority, I unhappily quote

theſe his words, *p.* 143. in his Diſcourſe concerning the Fanaticiſme of the *Roman* Church; *By Fanaticiſme we underſtand either an Enthuſiaſtick way of Religion, or reſiſting Authority, under pretence of Religion.* Now I thought, that Dr. *St.* in the forementioned words had given us two different Notions, or Deſcriptions, of Fanaticiſme; but I was miſtaken. For the Dr. as it ſeems, intended only in that place to aſſign two ſorts of Fanaticiſme. The reaſon of my miſtake was, becauſe I ſuppoſed, that the Dr. proceeded like a Scholar, and that accordingly, beginning to treat of Fanaticiſme, he would give us ſome Deſcription thereof. But he very illogically tells us, how many ſorts of Fanaticiſme there are, without ever telling us what it is. I hope, he will pardon this miſtake; and I promiſe never more to be miſtaken in him upon that account; nor ever to ſuppoſe, that he proceeds like a Scholar.

Neither does this miſtake of mine obſtruct the truth of the abovementioned Propoſition, layed down by me; which I proved from the common perſwaſion of

Man-

Mankind. For no body judges that to be Fanaticiſm, which is not grounded upon a private Spirit, and Judgment, contrary to Authority. Neither does, nor can the Dr. deny it. Hence I inferred, that the very conſtitution of the *Roman* Church, (which we both ſuppoſe to be a True Church) is deſtructive to Fanaticiſme, becauſe ſhe does not leave every one to be guided by his private Spirit, and Judgment, in matters of Religion, and in the Interpretation of Scripture; but obliges all to ſubmit to her judgment, as is manifeſt: neither can the Dr. queſtion it; ſince he oftentimes complains of the Tyranny (as he is pleaſed to term it) of the *Roman* Church in this point. See *Doctor Stillingfleet againſt Doctor Stillingfleet*, *pag.* 10. all which he paſſes over in ſilence.

Pag. 52. the Dr. wonders, why I do not ſpeak a word of the Fanatick Principles of Rebellion owned, as he will needs have it, by the Jeſuitical party, *viz. The King's deriving his power from the people, and the people's Authority to call the King to account, and if they ſee good*

good, to take away his Power, and to change the Government: and not only so, but to take away his Life too; which pestilent Principles he had quoted out of *Mariana*, a Jesuit: and to shew, that not only the Jesuits, but also the *Roman* Church does approve these Principles, (which was his main task) he adds, that *the party, which owns these Principles* [Jesuits] *is to this day the most countenanced, and encouraged at Rome.* So that he not only Fathers the forementioned Principles upon the whole Body of the Jesuits, because they were delivered by one of their Community; but also upon *Rome*, because it favours the Jesuits; which Argument of the Dr's. is as conclusive, as if you should Argue thus; *Hugh Peters*, a Member of the University of *Cambridge*, preached in the late Wars Rebellious Principles; Therefore not only the University of *Cambridge*, but his Majesty also, who hath shewen a a particular kindness for that University, do countenance such Principles. Who would not contemn such a Consequence? And yet the University of *Cambridge* has not made a more publick detestation

teſtation of thoſe Rebellious Principles of *Hugh Peters*, than the Body of the Jeſuits has made of the forementioned Doctrines of *Mariana*.

Beſides, the Pope, even in the common opinion of Proteſtants, is a Sovereign Temporal Prince of *Rome*, and its adjacent Territories, and as zealous (or more, if we believe Proteſtants) of his civil Authority, as ony other Temporal Prince whatſoever, how then is it credible, that he ſhould countenance ſo much the Jeſuits, as the Dr. ſaies he does; if they did allow ſuch Rebellious Principles, deſtructive to the Sovereignty of Temporal Princes? Moreover, that party Dr. *St.* ſpeaks of, is countenanced by ſeveral Kings, who would be loth to be deprived of their Kingdoms. But alas for them! poor Princes, they do not underſtand the Intrigues of the Jeſuits, though they converſe often with them: neither have they men about them, able to diſcover ſuch pernicious Doctrines. King *Henry* the 4*th*, of *France*, his Majeſties Grandfather, and the preſent *French* King, (both favourers of the Jeſuits) are unacquainted

ed with matters of State, and Civil Government: but Dr. *Edward Stillingfleet*, the great Polititian of the world, comprehends clearly the true intereſt of Princes; and though he has ſcarſe ever had any converſe with Jeſuits, yet with the ſubtlety of his private Spirit, (whereby he is able to diſcover in a moment, what Scriptures are Canonical, and which is their legitimate ſenſe) he has learned their Intrigues, and peſtilent Principles. Finally, thoſe, who underſtand the temper of *Rome* better than Dr. *St.* affirm, that the Dominicans, and Clergy, are as much (or more) countenanced there, than Jeſuits: and yet the Dominicans and Clergy, if we believe Dr. *St.* are no great friends to Jeſuits.

In the ſame page he ſaies, That *if* J. W. *anſwer again, let him ſpeak out like a man, concerning thoſe Rebellious Principles* abovementioned. Well then, *J. W.* ſpeaks out like a man, and tells the Dr. plainly, That he would be very ſorry, were he not perſwaded, that he detected the aforeſaid Principles more, than the Dr. himſelf does; for all that he can gather from his works. For,

what

whatever Dr. *St.*'s practices have been, which *J. W.* has not yet made it his business to enquire after; yet even those very Principles, whereby he pretends to clear the Protestant Church from the Crime of Schisme, do vindicate, had they any force in them, all Rebellions, and Treacherous Conspiracies, though never so execrable; and are most destructive to all Civil Government, than any Doctrines of *Mariana*, as will manifestly appear, to whoever shall take pains to compare them: And, to apply the Dr.'s own words to himself, in his Answer to Dr. *Cressy*'s Apologetical Epistle, *p.* 475. *He that owns the Principles that lead to him Treason, wants only an opportunity to act them.* So that if Dr. *St.* has a just, and real zeal for his Majesties Interest and Security, according to what he affirms (*pag.* 52.) his Principles do not lead him unto it, but the prospect of some advantage thereby.

I proved the *Roman* Church to be free from Fanaticisme, because all Fanaticisme, as I shewed, or at least that sort of Fanaticisme, which maintaines rebellious Principles, *is against all Lawful and*

and competent Authority; as Dr. *St.* himself must needs confess. Now what is countenanced by a competent, and lawful authority, is not against all such authority, as is manifest; and consequently, cannot be Fanaticisme, at least that sort of Fanaticisme, that maintains rebellious Principles. Since therefore the *Roman* Church is a True Church, unerring in all Articles of Faith, and since the Authority of a True Church, is a lawful Authority, and sufficient to clear particular waies of proceeding from Fanaticisme, as with several instances I have shewen (*pag.* 9.) in the proof of my fourth Proposition, though the Dr. cunningly passes them over, it evidently follows, That whatever the *Roman* Church countenances, as long as she remains a True Church, cannot be Fanaticisme, nor Rebellion; and by consequence she is free from those crimes. For why should any one impute to her that, which she does not countenance?

To this the Dr. Answers (*pag.* 54.) First, That *he charged as Fanaticks several persons in our Church, who were never countenanced by her, neither did they submit*

mit to her Authority. But what anſwer is this to me; who pretended only to clear our Church from Fanaticiſme? and how can ſhe be juſtly impeached of Fanaticiſme, which ſhe does not allow of? Yea, the Principal deſign of the Dr. in that Chapter, was to Charge the *Roman* Church with Fanaticiſme, as appears from its Title. But he adds, that he produced thoſe inſtances to prove againſt his Adverſary *T. G. That the Sects, and Fanaticiſms among Proteſtants here in England, could not be the effect of the reformation, ſince there were as wild, and extravagant Fanaticiſms before.* Good! juſt, as if he ſhould have argued in this manner. King *Henry* the 8*th*, or *Edward* the 6*th*, could not bring in Proteſtancy here in *England*, becauſe *Luther* had broached it before in *Germany*. There have been Fanaticks heretofore among the *Roman* Catholicks, as there are now among Proteſtants: But with this difference; That the very Conſtitution of the *Roman Church* is repugnant to Fanaticiſme; ſince it expreſsly prohibits men to be guided by their own private Reaſon in the Interpretation

tion of Scripture, and obliges all to ſubmit to her judgment. On the contrary, the Church of *England*, as it is conſtituted, according to Dr. *St.*'s Expoſition, favours all ſorts of Fanaticiſme, ſince it permits every one to be led by his own private Spirit in the Interpretation of Scripture, without obliging him to ſubmit to the Judgment of any Church in ſuch matters.

He anſwers ſecondly, that if *whatever is countenanced by the Authority of a True Church, ceaſes to be Fanaticiſme*, there flow hence monſtrous Abſurdities. The firſt is, that a *prevailing Fanaticiſme ceaſes to be Fanaticiſme*, (*pag.* 55.) Is not this a ſtrange whimſie of the Drs. and a pregnant Argument, how little he values Church Authority, to ſay, that becauſe ſome particular way of Devotion comes to be approved, and countenanced by the Authority of a True Church, the approbation of the Church ſerves only to make it a greater, and a more prevailing Fanaticiſme, than it was before? whereas I proved in my Book (*pag.* 9.) with ſeveral inſtances, That the approbation of a True Church is ſufficient to

clear

clear particular waies of Devotion from the imputation of Fanaticiſme. So that the difference between Fanatick, and Non-fanatick waies of Devotion, does not conſiſt in the extravagancy rather of the one, and not of the other; (for both may be extravagant enough) but in that the former are againſt Authority, the latter according to Authority. I will explain this Doctrine, with the Example the Dr. alledges in the place now quoted, of Treaſon and Rebellion. What difference is there between a Loyal, and Rebellious Army? Both Plunder, Harras, Fight, and Kill. The difference only is, that a Loyal Army proceeds according to Authority, and by order of their true Sovereign: But a Rebellious Army acts contrary to Authority, and to the orders of their Prince. As therefore it would be extream ridiculous to affirm, That the approbation of a True and Lawful Prince ſerves only to make the proceedings of his Subjects approved by him, more Rebellious, or a more prevailing Rebellion; ſo it is abſurd to defend, as Dr. *St.* does, That the approbation of a

True Church renders particular waies of Devotion, approved by her, more lyable to Fanaticiſme, or a more prevailing Fanaticiſme.

But the Dr. urges, That this would be an excellent way to vindicate the Fanaticiſme of the late times; which, *becauſe countenanced by an Authority ſuppoſed competent enough by ſome, who then writ of Obedience and Government, it ceaſes to be Fanaticiſme.* Speak out Doctor, was *Cromwell* a True and Lawful Governour of this Kingdome, or not? if you ſay, he was not, how can you have the confidence to parallel our caſe with theirs? ſince you your ſelf defend the *Roman* Church to be a True & Lawful Church; and the very ſame with your own, if you ſay, that he was a True and Lawful Governour, and his Authority competent, where is your Loyalty? As for the Writer of the Book entituled *Obedience and Government*, let him anſwer for himſelf. I deteſt that Doctrine: neither am I reſponſable for what that Author affirms: as neither Dr. *St.* will think himſelf obliged to own, whatever Proteſtants did in the late Rebellion.

The

The second Absurdity he pretends to infer from our Doctrine is, That Prophets, and Apostles, nay our Lord himself, are according to this Rule, unavoidably Fanaticks. For *what competent Authority*, saies he (*pag.* 56.) *had they to countenance them?* Are you in earnest Doctor, had Christ, the Prophets, and Apostles no competent Authority to countenance their proceedings? This indeed is to cast them into the common heard of Fanaticks, since no competent Authority, neither Humane, nor Divine, did countenance, or approve their Preaching. Can the Dr. deny, but that Christ, the Apostles, and Prophets were countenanced by Divine Authority, manifested by unquestionable Miracles? or will he say, That Divine Authority, manifested by these Miracles, is not an Authority competent enough to vindicate such actions as it approves of from the Crime of Fanaticisme?

But the Dr. presses, that the Jewish Church, though *not yet cast off, while our Saviour lived*, did not countenance him, nor his Apostles. What then? did I ever affirm, that the Authority of a

True Church was determinately neceſſary to clear particular practices from Fanaticiſme, as the Dr. moſt groſsly ſuppoſes I did. I defended indeed, that the Authority of a True Church is ſufficient to clear ſuch actions from Fanaticiſme; but I never aſſerted that it was neceſſary; yea I inſinuated the contrary (*pag.* 9.) There are two waies to commiſſion men to Preach, and to Authorize their manners of Devotion: Both of them ſufficient; but neither of them determinately neceſſary; the one extraordinary, when God by evident Miracles declares, that ſuch men are commiſſioned by him: and in this manner Chriſt, the Prophets and the Apoſtles were commiſſioned by him: the other Ordinary; when the Paſtours of the True Church authorize men to Preach, or approve of ſuch particular waies of Devotion: and in this ſenſe I cleared the particular waies of Devotion countenanced by the *Roman* Church; which the Dr. confeſſes to be a True Church; from the Aſperſion of Fanaticiſme. Neither can one reaſonably argue, that what is not countenanced

ced in the Second and Ordinary way, is not countenanced by a competent Authority; since it may be approved of in an Extraordinary way.

And though the Jews did not follow the Doctrine of Christ, yet they acknowledged his Commission, and Gods Broad seal, *viz.* evident Miracles wrought by him; when in a full Assembly they affirmed (*Joan* 11.) *Hic homo multa Signa facit*; *This man* (Christ) *works many Miracles*; and certainly, such a publick attestation as this was enough to countenance and acknowledge his Commission; though out of obstinacy they would not submit to his Doctrine: as *Pilate* declared our Saviour to be innocent, and guiltless, yet out of fear, lest he should disgust *Cæsar*, condemned him to death.

I cannot omit here the two famous, yet Contradictory Revelations, which are said to have been made to St. *Bridgit*, and St. *Catherin*, concerning the immaculate Conception of our Blessed Lady: To St. *Bridgit*, that she was conceived without Original Sin; To St. *Catherin*, that she was conceived with

Original Sin. Dr. *St.* ſcarce publiſhes a Book, wherein he does not inſert theſe Revelations; pretending thereby to blow up the Infallibility of the *Roman* Church; ſince ſhe Canonized for Saints both St. *Bridgit*, and St. *Catherin*; and approves their Revelations; and conſequently ſomething that is falſe; as neceſſarily one of the forementioned Revelations muſt be: particularly he endeavours to prove hence againſt me, That *ſubmiſſion to the Judgment of the Church is not a Rule to judge Fanaticiſme by*. For both theſe Revelations were approved of by the *Roman* Church; and yet one of them was falſe; and therefore Fanatical: and one of thoſe Saints either was deceived, or went about to deceive; and by conſequence was a Fanatick. See the Dr. *pag.* 61, 62.

To this I anſwer, that the Dr. has never yet ſhewn, That thoſe two Revelations of the abovementioned Saints, were approved of in particular by the *Roman* Church, or in general. True it is, that the *Roman* Church declares them both to be Saints, and to be *famous for their Revelations*: but ſhe does not therefore

fore approve of every porticular Revelation, related to have been made unto them. The whole Chriſtian Church looks upon Chriſt, and his Apoſtles as *famous for their Miracles and Doctrines*: ſhall we therefore hence infer, that the whole Chriſtian Church approves of every particular Miracle, related of them by any Author whatſoever; and of every particular Doctrine which ſome one, or other teaches, to have been delivered by them? Are there not many falſe Miracles, and Doctrines, father'd upon Chriſt and his Apoſtles? wherefore to the end, that the *Roman* Church be proved Fallible, by reaſon of the two forementioned Revelations, contrary the one to the other, it was neceſſary for Dr. *St.* to have ſhewen, that they were both approved of by our Church: which the Dr. has not yet done. Thoſe two Saints might be famous for their Revelations, and deſervedly look'd upon as ſuch, though the aboveſaid two Revelations, or at leaſt one of them, had been forged.

Moreover, though one of theſe two Revelations, as being contrary one to

the other, was falſe; and the perſon to whom ſuch a Revelation is ſayed to have been made, either deceived, or was deceived, ſuppoſing ſhe affirmed, that ſhe had had ſuch a Revelation; yet it does not therefore follow, that either ſuch a Revelation was Fanaticiſme, or ſuch a perſon a Fanatick. For ſure Dr. *St.* will not enlarge ſo much the roll of Fanaticks, as to affirm, *That all ſuch as are deceived, are Fanaticks.* For ſo he muſt caſt himſelf into that heard: ſince, certainly he is not ſo vain, as to think, that in no Interpretation of Scripture, in no Tenet whatſoever, of ſo many, as he has laid down in his Books, he has been deceived. Wherefore, as an unjuſt Warr is not Rebellion, if it be countenanced by the Authority, of a True and Lawful Sovereign Prince: For Sovereigns may wage unjuſt Warrs: So neither a falſe Revelation is Fanaticiſme, if it be countenanced by the Authority of the True Church; ſuppoſing, that the True Church may countenance ſuch Revelations. For it is *Eſſential to Fanaticiſme*, as we have ſeen, to be contrary to Authority.

I have enlarged my ſelf upon this point of Fanaticiſme, becauſe the Dr. ſeems to hugg it, as the *Benjamin* of his Mimical Wit, and preſumes ſo much of his endeavours in this kind, that he boldly atteſts, as we hinted above, that his Adverſaries have not ſaid ſo much as *one wiſe word*, to clear their Church from the Aſperſion of Fanaticiſme. The Dr. vapours, *pag.* 59. That this Charge of Fanaticiſme *was a new Charge* (yet the Author of Τῷ Καθολικῷ, *Stillingfleeton*, tells us, whence he borrowed it) snd *neither* Bellarmin, Becanus, *or any of their old beaten Souldiers, could give them any aſſiſtance, they found not the Title of the Fanaticiſme of the* Roman *Church, in any of their Common place Books; therefore plain Mother-wit muſt help them.* 'Tis a wonder, that order has not been given to erect a Statue to Dr. *St.* for ſo rare an Invention as this is, of *the Fanaticiſme of the* Roman *Church*; and if his Mother-wit could help him, without the aſſiſtance of Common-place Books, to frame this new Charge againſt us, well may the Mother-wit of his Adverſaries help them,

them, without needing the assistance of any *Staunch-Author*; for such he terms our Antient Writers, to answer it? There is a short way to answer Dr. *St.*'s Books, without needing to read Antient Authors. Read only his Books, and you will find the Answer to whatever he objects against us: so full they are of *self-contradictions*: They are like to certain venemous Beasts, that breed in themselves the Antidote against their own poison.

I have lately read a perfect Character of Dr. *St's.* proceedings, in charging the *Roman* Church with Fanaticisme, drawn by himself in a Sermon preached before his Majesty 24. of *February* last, 1674. Where shewing, how licentious people among the Gentiles heretofore (as in these times among Christians) *brought Vertue into Contempt*, and having assigned for the first *Medium* they laid hold of to effect their wicked design, *viz. The seperating Religion and morality from each other*, he adds (page 11.) These words. *The next thing was to make it* [*vertue*] *to appear ridiculous; which was a certain way to make Fools out of love with it*:

it: who do not consider what is fit to be laughed at, but what is so. *When* Socrates, *at* Athens, *undertook with many sharp, and cutting Ironies, to reprove the vices of his age, and with a great deal of Wit and Reason, to perswade men to the sober practice of vertue, the licentious people knew not what to do with him: For they were not able to withstand the force of his Argments. At last* Aristophanes, *(having a Comical Wit, whereby he was able to make any thing seem ridicalous) although he knew very well the Wisdome and Learniug of* Socrates, *yet to please, and humour the people, he brings him upon the Stage, and represents his grave instructions after such a manner as turned all into a matter of laughter to the people of* Athens ——— *This is the method, which men take when they set their wits against Vertue, and Goodness: They know it is impossible to argue men out of it: but it is very easie, by ridiculous postures, and mimical gestures, and profane Similitudes to put so grave, and modest a thing, as Vertue is, out of countenance, among those, who are sure to laugh on the other side. I do not think, that such things can signifie much to wise men:*

but

but when was the world made up of ſuch? and therefore it ſignifies very much to the miſchief of thoſe, who have not the courage to love deſpiſed Vertue, nor to defend a cauſe that is laughed down.

Thus far the Dr. All which may be eaſily applied to Dr. *St.* himſelf.

For the main task of the Dr. in his Treatiſe of *the Fanaticiſme of the* Roman *Church*, was to render ridiculous the Religious practices of the *Roman* Catholicks, and of ſo many Saints, famous throughout the world, for their Zeal and Piety; which (to uſe his own words) *was a certain way to make fools out of love with* our Church; *who do not conſider what is fit to be laughed at, but what is ſo.* He could not be ignorant of the great reputation, even the modern Saints of our Church deſervedly enjoy, upon account of their Vertue; far beyond what *Socrates* had: yet like another *Ariſtophanes*, having a Comical, and Drolling Wit, whereby he is able to make any thing, though never ſo Sacred, to ſeem ridiculous, *only to pleaſe, and humour Licentious people*, he repreſents their grave Inſtructions, and their

Cha-

Charitable and devout practices, in such a manner, *as he turns all into a matter of Laughter*. He knows it is impossible, to argue judicious men out of the opinion they have of St. *Bennet*, St. *Dominick*, St. *Francis*, St. *Ignatius*, and St. *Teresa*: but it is very easie, by Mimical Expressions, and profane Similitudes, to render them ridiculous, and contemptible among those, who *are sure to laugh on the other side*. But such proceedings can signifie nothing to Wise men; but only to such as *have not courage, to love despised Vertue, nor to defend a Cause that is laughed down*.

Come, Come, Dr. *Stillingfleet*, it is too notorious to all intelligent persons, what you pretend with this scurrilous, & drolling way of attacking the *Roman* Church. Your aim is to bring all Religion and Vertue into Contempt, and Derision, however you endeavour to disguized so mischievous a design with all Artifices possible. I wish from my heart, I were able to impute your Misdemeanours, and Miscarriages in your Controversial Books, to Ignorance, or Inadvertency: But on the one side your Mi-

Miſtakes are ſo groſs, your Contradictions ſo palpable, and your Aſperſions ſo notoriouſly ſcurrilous, that he muſt needs be a Fool, who cannot ſee them; and on the other ſide, the works you have publiſhed, do proclaim you no Fool; that I am forced to impute your unhandſome proceedings to the Malice of your Will, not the Ignorance of your Underſtanding.

The Dr. (*pag.* 70.) endeavouring to ſtave off the Self-contradiction charged upon him, in imputing to the *Roman* Church Diviſions in matters of Faith, ſaies thus. *But the fourth and fifth Propoſition (viz. of my Book in this point) are the moſt healing Principles, that have yet been thought on. Fie for ſhame! Why ſhould we and they of the Church of* Rome, *quarrel thus long! We are very well agreed in all matters of Faith; as I ſhall demonſtratively prove it from the Argument of* J. W. *drawn from his two laſt Propoſitions.* All, who aſſent unto the antient Creeds, are undivided in matters of Faith, by Prop. 4. But both Papiſts and Proteſtants do aſſent unto the Antient Creeds. —— *Ergo*, they are undivided in matters of Faith.

Faith. *And hath not* J. W. *now done his buſineſs, and very ſubſtantially proved the thing he intended? But I hope we may enjoy the benefit of it, as well as thoſe of the Church of* Rome, *and that they will not henceforward charge us with dividing from their Church in any matters of Faith, ſince we are all agreed in owning the antient Creeds; and ſeeing we are not divided from the Church, but by differing in matters of Faith, according to his Propoſition, it follows, that we are ſtill Members of the True Church; and therefore neither guilty of Hereſie, nor Sciſme.*

By what Dr. *St.* ſets down here, any prudent man may clearly ſee, how groſsly, and wilfully he miſtakes himſelf. My fourth Propoſition, ſet down by me, *pag.* 12. whereof the Dr. makes mention in the place now quoted, and to which I refer my ſelf in the Syllogiſm I frame, *pag.* 13. runs thus. *All thoſe, who aſſent to the antient Creeds, are, according to Dr. St.'s opinion* (mark thoſe words) *undivided in matters and Articles of Faith*; and that was the Dr.'s perſwaſion, I proved out of his *Rational Account, pag.* 56, 58. and thence I con-

conclude, *pag.* 13. that *according to Dr.* St. (mark those words) *All those, who agree to the antient Creeds, are of the same Communion, and undivided in matters of Faith.* Now this wise Dr. most grosly supposes, that it is the same for me to say, *All those, who agree to the antient Creeds, are, according to Dr.* St. *undivided in matters of Faith,* (where I only relate Dr. *St.*'s opinion, & argue thence against him *ad hominem*) or to say absolutely, *All those, who agree to the antient Creeds, are undivided in matters of Faith:* which words pronounced so without any modification, import, as if I were of that perswasion: whereas I am very far from it: neither here, nor in any other place, do I defend any such Doctrine. Wherefore the *Major* Proposition, in the Syllogism set down by the Dr. is in *his opinion* True, (and consequently may be subservient to prove against him) but *in my opinion* it is false, and of no force to demonstrate any thing against me: and I confess, that it is a very compendious way to compose the differences between me and the Dr. if one may suppose (as he here does) That *what he*

saies,

ſaies, I ſay, and that it is the *very ſame* for me to affirm, ſuch a thing is ſo, according to Dr. *St*'s opinion, or it is true, that Dr. *St.* thinks ſo, and ſuch a thing is ſo, or it is true what Dr. *St.* thinks: which Propoſitions, doubtleſs, are very different. For, to the truth of the former Propoſition 'tis enough, that Dr. *St.* be of that opinion, whether his opinion be true or falſe: but to the truth of the latter, 'tis requiſite, that his opinion be true, and that what he ſaies be ſo, as he ſaies it is.

Certainly, Chriſtians may truly affirm without forfeiting their Faith, that *according to the opinion of the Jews, Chriſt is not the Meſſias*: will the Dr. therefore infer hence, that Chriſtians may truly affirm, that *Chriſt is not the Meſſias?* or that *Chriſtians and Jews are agreed in that main point?* Fie for ſhame! (to uſe your own expreſſion) you a Doctor of Divinity, and cannot diſtinguiſh between Propoſitions ſo notoriouſly different? Where is the ingenuity you ſo much boaſt of? Sure you imagined, that the Reader would be ſo ſilly, as to take upon your bare word, what you write,

or quote, without ever examining, or comparing it. By what I have said in reference to the *Major* Proposition of his Syllogisme, whereby he pretends to prove demonstratively against us, That both Catholicks and Protestants are agreed in matters of Faith, any one may judge, what Demonstrations we are to expect from Dr. *St.*

As concerning the *Minor* Proposition of the Drs. Syllogisme, he supposes it to be the same with my Fifth; wherein he is also wilfully mistaken. For my Fifth Proposition is this, *All Roman Catholicks assent unto the antient Creeds*; whereas his *Minor* was this, *Both Papists and Protestants do assent unto the Antient Creeds*; where he adds, That *Protestants assent unto the Antient Creeds*; which I never affirmed: and the Dr. cannot be ignorant, that *Roman-Catholicks* hold Protestants do not believe in that Article even of the Apostles Creed, *Sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam*; which in its true, and legitimate sense signifies the *Roman* Catholick Church: and those only are to be thought to believe Scripture, and the Antient Creeds, who believe them

in the true, and legitimate ſenſe: which in our Doctrine is only that ſenſe, which is agreable, or not repugnant, to the expoſition of the *Roman* Catholick Church. So that Proteſtants, according to the perſwaſion of Catholicks, do not believe the Antient Creeds; becauſe they do not believe them rightly underſtood: But according to Dr. *St.*'s opinion *Roman* Catholicks do believe the Scripture, and the Antient Creeds, rightly underſtood. For his Rule is, that whoever underſtands Scripture, or the Antient Creeds, as by *his natural faculty of diſcerning Truth and Falſhood, he thinks they are to be underſtood, ſuch an one rightly underſtands them.* Now *Roman* Catholicks underſtand them, as the Natural Faculty in them of diſcerning Truth and Falſhood, teaches them: and Dr. *St.* ought to believe that we do ſo, as he will have us to believe the like of him: and if we do ſubmit to the judgment of the *Roman* Catholick Church, concerning the true interpretation of Scripture, and of the Antient Creeds, the Natural Reaſon that is in us, teaches us ſo to do. And ſure Dr. *St.* will not ſo far

abaſe the Authority of the True Church, and of her Doctors, as to aſſert, that whoever is induced by their Authority, to believe ſuch to be the true ſenſe of ſuch particular places of Scripture, as they expound them in, muſt needs miſ-interpret them.

Hence I infer, that neither the *Minor* Propoſition in the Drs. Syllogiſme is granted by us: and is not the Dr. like to demonſtrate many things, if ſuch be his Demonſtrations, that both the *Major*, and *Minor* are denied by his Adverſaries? is not this to do his buſineſs *very ſubſtantially?* Yet the forementioned Syllogiſme is a demonſtration againſt the Dr. that *Roman* Catholicks and Proteſtants are undivided in matters of Faith *according to his opinion*; and conſequently muſt be granted by him to be *both of the ſame Church*: and I concluded thence above, that he muſt either deny the Proteſtant Church to be True, or grant the *Roman* Church to be ſo.

Moreover, the Syllogiſme I form, *pag.* 13. out of my Fourth and Fifth Propoſition. is a demonſtration againſt Dr. *St.* That all *Roman* Catholicks, as long

long as they remain ſo, are undivided in matters of Faith: which is all I there pretended. For I never intended to prove, that they were ſo undivided with ſuch, as are out of their Communion.

CHAP. XI.

Some Difficulties raiſed by the Dr. againſt my Judgment concerning his manner of proceeding, Rejected.

BEfore I make an end, I cannot but take notice of ſome Difficulties Dr. *St.* ſets down in his particular Preface, relating to the Judgment I frame of his manner of Proceeding, in theſe words couched by me *pag.* 11. *I verily believe, that Dr.* St. *did his Intereſt byaſs him that way, could with* Lucian, Porphyrius, *and thoſe many Libertines of our Country, (the ſpawn of ſuch Books as theſe) he could I ſay, flurt with as much picquantneſs, and railery at Chriſtian Religion, as he does at the* Roman, *char-*

ging Chriſtians with Superſtitions, Corruptions, and Diſſenſions. What does he not ſay againſt theſe words? He calls them *a baſe Suggeſtion, wherein there is no colour of Truth.* (pag. 8.) *A ſlie Inſinuation: a Calumny too groſs, to need any farther Anſwer,* (pag. 9.) and that *it had been better to have called him an Atheiſt in plain terms.* p. 8. I perceive the man is angry. 'Tis neceſſary to treat him mildly, that he may come to himſelf. But withal I reflect, that many do endeavour to ſupply with Anger, the want of Reaſon, and to Hector one with Bravadoes into their opinion, when they cannot draw him with Arguments.

Let us examin in particular what he objects againſt the fore-mentioned words. He ſaies *That I very honeſtly diſtinguiſh the Chriſtian Religion, and the Roman from each other.* And ſure, I ſhould not deal honeſtly, did I not diſtinguiſh the *Roman* Religion from the Chriſtian, as a *Species* from the *Genus*, and as a *part* from the *whole*. For we do not deny, but that there are many vulgarly called Chriſtians, becauſe they are truly

truly Chriſtened, and profeſs to believe in Chriſt, and acknowledge the Apoſtles Creed, although interpreted in their way. Such were *Donatiſts*, *Pelagians*, *Arians*, and others, held by us, and Proteſtants too, for Hereticks; who are never owned to be *Roman* Catholicks. I confeſs, I have not learn'd, as yet, ſo great kindneſs for our Church, as to make it the ſame Individual Church, (thoſe who do ſo with their own Church, let them anſwer for themſelves) with an Heretical, nay with an Idolatrous Church. Wherefore 'tis manifeſt, that the Chriſtian Religion, taken in the aforeſaid ſenſe, does comprehend more than the *Roman*. So that what I intended in the forementioned place, was, that the way Dr. *St.* takes to impugne the particular Tenets of the *Roman* Church, does, if it be of any force, annul the *common Principles* of Chriſtianity, wherein all thoſe, who own themſelves to be Chriſtians, do agree: And that this was my meaning, any one, who was not reſolved to quibble, might eaſily have ſeen.

In the next place he asks me, *pag.* 8.

What is this verily believe *of mine grounded upon?* Doubtleſs the rage my words put him into, did not let him ſee what followed. For I layed down the Reaſons of what before I aſſerted, in theſe words. *For if it be a rational way of proceeding, to rally together whatever has been objected by the Enemies of a Community, without making mention of the Anſwers given by them, or the ſentence pronounced in their favour; and to Father upon the whole Body, the miſdemeanours of ſome members, although diſowned by the Major part,* (which are the Artifices uſed by Dr. *St.* in his works againſt Catholicks) *what Community is there ſo holy, which may not eaſily be traduced?* All this the Dr. very handſomly omits, without ſo much as anſwering a word thereunto. For he is too wiſe to take notice of any thing, that may prejudice his deſign; and only is pleaſed to divert the Reader with impertinent Queſtions: as whether *This* verily believe *of mine be grounded upon the Authority of* our Church, or *rather upon ſome Viſion, or Revelation made by ſome of our Saints?* Whereas in the fore-mentioned words the Motives of that my

my belief are clearly ſet down. The Dr. cannot deny, but that among Chriſtians, even of the Primitive Church, there were committed Inceſt, Simony, Adultery, and ſeveral other horrid Crimes, worſe than thoſe, which the very Heathens did commit; as may be gathered out of the Goſpel, the Acts, and the Epiſtles of the Apoſtles; and that there were Hereſies among them, as that of the *Nicolaites*. Wherefore, if the miſdemeanours of ſome Members may be fathered upon the whole Community, although diſowned by the Major part, this abſurdity would follow, that the Chriſtan Religion, even when it was in its Primitive purity, might be called an Inceſtuous Simonical, Adulterous, Heretical, and a worſe Religion than Paganiſme.

Again, 'tis certain, that many Enormous things were objected by the Jews againſt our Saviour; as he was a Blaſphemer, a Seducer, a Drunkard, and that he Preached Sedition; and that he was poſſeſs'd by the Devil, and that the Religion he founded, was a ridiculous, ſcandalous, and Superſtitious Religion.

Now

Now ſhould one of a picquant, and malicious wit, repreſent theſe, and ſeveral other blemiſhes, objected againſt Chriſt, & his Religion, without taking notice of the Anſwers given them, nor of the pregnant Arguments, produced in favour, and vindication of Chriſt and his Religion; what a low opinion, what an averſion from Chriſtian Religion, would ſuch a man breed in thoſe, who either by reaſon of their Education, or upon ſome other account were ignorant of the true condition of Chriſtian Religion, and had already ſome prejudice againſt it?

That theſe are the Artifices uſed by Dr. *Still.* againſt *Roman* Catholicks might be evidenced by ſeveral inſtances taken out of his works. One of the proofs that he alledges, to evince the *Roman* Church to be guilty of Fanaticiſme (for that was his intent) are the extravagancies of the *Alumbradoe's* and *Fratricelli*; who were not only diſowned, but condemned by the Prelates of the *Roman* Church.

Moreover, he pretends to father upon the *Roman* Church, the *Gun-powder* Trea-

Treaſon, though deteſted by *Roman* Catholicks; and without ſo much as taking notice of the Sentence, that King *James*, who was moſt concerned in that plot, gave in Vindication of Catholicks, in his own Declaration about it, ſaying, *That the generality of his Catholick Subjects did abhor ſuch a deteſtable Conſpiracy, no leſs than he himſelf.* If ſuch Artifices therefore as theſe be warrantable, *what Community is there ſo holy*, (I ſay again) *which may not eaſily be traduced?* Should God permit Dr. *St.* as certainly he may, to declare himſelf a Jew, or an Atheiſt; he has already laid up good ſtore of Arguments, wherewith, according to his manner of proceeding, to traduce Chriſtianity; Fathering upon the Chriſtian Religion all the horrible ſins, that ever have been committed by any Chriſtian whatſoever, Proteſtant or Catholick. And if he ſhould want matter to fill up his Volumes, as following this way of attacking his Adverſary, he ſcarce ever can; he may ſuppoſe Chriſtians either to teach Crimes which they do not teach; or what they do teach, to be Crimes: which is the way he commonly

monly takes, to oppugne *Roman* Catholicks.

Since therefore the ſame Topicks, and Reaſons drawn from them, wherewith Dr. *St.* endeavours to traduce the particular Tenets of the *Roman* Religion, may without difficulty, be levelled againſt the general Principles of Chriſtian Religion; That he has been pleaſed to make uſe of thoſe Arguments, rather againſt the former, than the latter, could not proceed out of more Reaſon for the one, than for the other; and conſequently it proceeded from ſome Intereſt, (which has ſo great an Adſcendent over the hearts of men) or other paſſion, that byaſs'd him that way. Whence I affirmed, that had the ſame paſſion of Intereſt byaſſed him againſt Chriſtian Religion, which made him ſo malicious againſt the *Roman*, it is very credible, that he would have ſhewen himſelf as pieviſh againſt the one as the other. All this I have ſaid to ſignifie, what it was, that this *verily believe* of mine was founded upon.

In confirmation of what was couched in the foremention'd words, I added im-

immediately, *But this Dr. is ſo unfortunate, as well in vindicating the Proteſtant, as in attacking the* Roman *Church, that he neither produces any thing in vindication of Proteſtancy, but the ſame, or the like, may be alledged in defence of Socinianiſme, and other Hereſies, condemned as ſuch by Proteſtants.* [See *the Guide in Controverſies, Diſcourſe* 4.] nor *oppoſes any thing againſt the* Roman *Religion; but the ſame, or the like, may be objected by Jews, or Pagans, againſt the Chriſtian: which, according to Scripture, is a ſcandal to the former, and a deriſion to the latter. So that whoever will be pleaſed to reflect ſeriouſly upon his Diſcourſes, he may clearly ſee, that his Proofs for Proteſtancy will aſſoon make one a Socinian, as a Proteſtant; and his objections againſt Catholicks will aſſoon make one no Chriſtian, as no Catholick.* And what does the Dr. anſwer to all this? All that he could; which is juſt nothing: not taking ſo much as notice of the forementioned words: although they contain two main points; which are proved at large by ſeveral Catholick Authors, and do utterly enervate whatſoever Dr. *St.* brings for himſelf,

ſelf, or againſt us: and do moreover force the Dr. himſelf, to ſalve whatever he produces againſt Catholicks, if he will be a Chriſtian; and to confeſs the inanity of whatever he alledges for Proteſtants, as ſuch, if he will not be a Socinian.

The firſt point is, that he alledges nothing in defence of Proteſtancy as Proteſtancy, which may not be alledged, and with the ſame force too, in vindication of Socinianiſme, or any other Hereſie. This point has been diſcuſs'd at large by thoſe two famous, and ſolid Divines, the Author of *Proteſtancy without Principles*, and *The Guide in Controverſies*, (Diſc. 4. now quoted) wherein is contained a Plea between a Proteſtant and a Socinian. And although Dr. *St.* has had at laſt the courage to offer at an anſwer to the forementioned Books, yet he has not dared to touch this point: which is no ſmall confirmation of the opinion ſome have conceived, that Dr. *St.* is a Socinian: and yet the Church of *England* looks upon Socinians as Hereticks.

The ſecond point is, That Dr. *St.* produces

duces nothing againſt the particular Tenets of the *Roman* Church, but the ſame, or the like, may be objected by Jews, Turks, Pagans, or Libertins, againſt the Common Principles of Chriſtianity: Neither is he ignorant, but that ſome Pagans look upon our Scriptures as Fables. no leſs than Dr. *St.* looks upon the Legends of our Saints as ſuch. The Jews alſo denyed the New Teſtament; and the Turks make our Scripture to truckle under to their Alcoran. This point is ſolidly diſcuſs'd in that erudite Book, *Reaſon and Religion*: and although the Dr. pretends to anſwer it, yet he prudently waves this point, or very ſlightly touches it; ſpending the far greater part of his Anſwer in ſcoffing at the Miracles of the *Roman* Church; even thoſe, which have been authentically approved in particular by her in the Canonization of Saints; thinking this a fit ſubject for his drolling Wit. Yet what he there ſaies concerning this Argument, is a new confirmation of this our ſecond point. For he objects nothing material againſt the Miracles of the *Roman* Church; but the ſame, or

the

the like, is, or may be objected by Libertins againſt the Miracles of Chriſt, the Prophets and the Apoſtles; as the ſame Author, in his late reply does make apparent.

Yet the Dr. to ſhew us that he is a Chriſtian, ſaies (*pag.* 8.) *That he has made it his buſineſs to aſſert the Truth of Chriſtian Religion, in a large Diſcourſe, ſeveral years ſince, publiſhed by him.* But to this he himſelf anſwers, bringing the Example of *Vanninus*, who writ for Providence, when he denied a Deity. *pag.* 9. he concludes thus. *In plain terms, I know but one way to ſatisfie ſuch as you are; (but I will keep from it as long as I can:) and that is to go to* Rome, *and to be burn'd for my Faith: For that is the kindneſs there ſhewed to thoſe, who contend for the purity of Chriſtian Religion, againſt the Corruptions of the* Roman. But the Dr. muſt pardon me, if I tell him plainly, that I cannot believe, he would ever be burn'd for defending the particular Tenets of the Proteſtant Church, ſince he himſelf affirms, in his *Rational Account*, pag. 54, 55. That *ſuch Tenets are neither Articles of Faith, nor neceſſary to be believed, either*

either neceſſitate medij, *or* præcepti: *no Legacies of Chriſt, or his Apoſtles; but only inferiour Truths, and meer pious opinions; which no body is bound to believe.* Nay we cannot be ſecure, that the Dr. does aſſent to them; but perhaps in his heart he holds the contrary Doctrines. For, according to his Cavils *about the intention of the Prieſt*, one can have no ſecurity of the *intention*, or *thoughts* of other men. And why ſhould I think, that Dr. *St.* does love ſo little his own life, as to be burn'd for the defence of ſuch Tenets, which, according to his own Principles, he is not bound to aſſent unto; and perhaps, in his heart, for ought I know, he does not believe them to be true. Certain it is, that ſhould he be burn'd for them, he would not be burn'd for his Faith, nor be a Martyr upon that account: ſince even in his own opinion, they are not *Articles of Faith.*

Moreover, ſhould Dr. *St.* be burn'd at *Rome* for contradicting, or oppoſing the Religion there eſtabliſhed, he would be burn'd as a Malefactour, even according to his own Churches Principles. For it is the Doctrine of the *Engliſh*

Church, that all *Soveraign Temporal Princes*, at leaſt ſuch as are Chriſtians, are *Supream Heads of the Church* in their reſpective Dominions: and conſequently, that all are bound, as long as they are in ſuch Dominions, not to contradict, nor oppoſe the Religion there eſtabliſhed by the Supream Prince. Since therefore Proteſtants confeſs the Pope to be Supream Temporal Prince of *Rome*, and its adjacent Territories, and accordingly to be Supream Head of the Church in thoſe places, ſeeing they own him to be a true Chriſtian Prince, (though they will needs have him to be Antichriſt) it manifeſtly follows, that even according to Proteſtant Principles, if Dr. *St.* ſhould be puniſhed at *Rome* for oppoſing the Religion there eſtabliſhed, and for drawing from it the Popes Subjects, he would ſuffer as a Malefactour.

Beſides, how civil *Rome* has ſhewen her ſelf to ſeveral *Engliſh* Proteſtants, perſons of Quality, who have gone thither to view the Curioſities of the City, they themſelves, many of them being yet alive, can witneſs: and from ſuch inſtan-

inſtances the world may judge, whether *Rome* has not been kinder to *Engliſh* Proteſtants, than *London* to *Italian* Papiſts. Yea, if Dr. *St.* has ſo much zeal, as to be burn'd for his Religion, 'tis not neceſſary for him to go ſo far as *Rome*. They may do him that kindneſs here in *England*; where ſeveral have been burn'd for Socinians, ſince Proteſtancy came in. In fine, we may ſecure Dr. *St.* that ſhould he perſiſt at *Rome*, to grant ſuch palpable Contradictions, as we have ſhewen he does, he would never be burn'd there for his Religion: yet I would not ſecure him, that in ſuch a caſe he ſhould not be ſhaved, and ſent to the *Pazzarelli*, as happened ſome years agoe to Three *Engliſh* Quakers: who having gone to *Rome* to Convert the Pope, as they ſaid, and Preaching in the publick Streets in a forreign Language, (it ſeems they had not yet the *Gift of Tongues*) were look'd upon as Madmen, and accordingly committed to *Bedlam*. Yet ſoon after, information being given in by ſome of our Nation, what manner of people they were, they were preſently ſet at liberty; and they

offered to ſupply them with Moneyes; which they refuſed. Whether, Dr. *St.* would imitate them in this, I know not.

The Dr. in his ſecond Diſcourſe, in the Dedicatory to the Earl of *Shaftsbury*, ſaies, *That if he once loſes his Senſes, or his Underſtanding*, that is, if he once falls mad, *he knows not whether it may be his Fortune to be carried to* Rome. But fear not, Dr. you will certainly be left in *London*, to go about the Streets ranting at Popery, and Popiſh Idolatry; (For commonly Madmen harp upon thoſe things, which made them run mad) or Singing the *Catholick Ballad*, or ſome ſuch other, to *Tom a Bedlams Tune*: and it will not be hard for the Dr. to ſay them without Book. For, as one affirmed, as truly as ingeniouſly, all ſuch Ballads, which have been lately publiſhed, are nothing elſe but Dr. *St.* put in Rhime. And the Dr. would do then quite as much good, by ſinging ſuch Ballads againſt Popery, as he has done hitherto by Preaching the like things againſt it. Dr. *St.*'s Works were heretofore look'd upon as Play-Books, as I have already Inſinuated. But now

it

it seems, they have degenerated into Ballads. He is resolved (I see) out of his exceeding great Charity, and Compliance, to oblige all sorts of Merry Wits.

Neither do I blame the Dr. for what he has Writ in defence of Christian Religion: yet I must tell him, that none court one more, than such as are secretly contriving his Ruine. What I blame in him is, That with the Objections he makes against the *Roman* Catholick Religion, he destroys Christian Religion, which before he had vindicated; and pulls down with one hand, what he had set up with the other: and I have evidenced already, that it is not enough for a Christian, to assent unto all the positive Tenets of Christianity, but 'tis also necessary not to teach any thing destructive to any of them.

But the Dr. retorts the Argument; and will needs have us to destroy Christianity with our manner of proceeding, (*pag.* 9.) and that *we cannot maintain the cause we have espoused, without plunging those, who relie upon our word, into the depth of Atheisme.* He conceives (forsooth) a great fear (alas, good

man!) that ſome, being preſs'd by our Arguments; will rather become no Chriſtians, or turn flat Atheiſts, than *Roman* Catholicks. Such is the hatred, and prejudice they have againſt the *Roman* Church.

The inanity of this Objection has been laid open above: it is grounded upon this pitiful Principle, *That we ought not to preſs men, out of good and ſolid Maxims, which they themſelves aſſent unto, to prove what we pretend, leaſt (perhaps) rather than they will grant what we endeavour to prove, they will denie thoſe common Principles, wherein they agreed with us*: and by conſequence make the gap, and difference between us wider. If Chriſtian Religion be ſo beautiful, ſolid, and incorrupt, as certainly it is; and the *Roman* Religion ſo Superſtitious, Idolatrous, & Ridiculous as he fancies it to be, ſure they are as different one from the other, as black from white. And what fear can there be, that men ever take white for black, or black for white; unleſs he ſuppoſes thoſe, with whom he deals, to have quite loſt their ſenſes, and underſtandings; yea to compare them

them together, if they be ſo different, is the beſt way, to make the Beauty of the one, and the Ill-favouredneſs of the other, appear the greater, according to that Maxime, *Oppoſita juxta ſe poſita magis eluceſcunt.* So that Dr. *St.* and his Aſſociates, do evidence to the world, either that they have a very low opinion of Chriſtian Religion, even when it was in its greateſt purity; ſince they think it ſo hard, that being faced with the *Roman* Religion, (which ſeems to them to be ſo full of Corruptions, Superſtitions, and abominations) the one may be diſtinguiſhed from the other: or that the *Roman* Religion is not ſo ridiculous, and ill-favoured, as they repreſent it to be; ſince it is ſo like the Chriſtian Religion, even in its greateſt Purity, that being compared together, 'tis extream difficult to know which is which; and that by ſuch a parallel men are incited, either to embrace them both, or reject them both.

The Dr. goes yet farther; and endeavouring to ſupply with counterfeited zeal the difficiency of true, and ſolid reaſons, puts down theſe words, *pag.*

11. *I would fain know of these men, whether they do in earnest make no difference between the Writings of such as Mother* Juliana, *and the Books of Scripture; between the Revelations of St.* Bridgit, *St.* Catherin, *&c. and those of the Prophets; between the actions of St.* Francis, *and* Ignatius Loyola, *and those of the Apostles? if they do not, I know who they are, that expose our Religion to purpose. If they do make a difference, how can the representing their Visions, and practises, reflect dishonour upon the other, so infinitely above them, so much more certainly conveighed down to us, with the consent of the whole Christian world?*

In answer to this Objection, I would fain know of the Dr. whether he does in earnest, make no difference between a Door, a Vine, a Worm, a Lamb, a Shepheard, *&c.* and Christ, our Saviour? If he does not, then Christ is no better than a Door, a Vine, a Worm, a Lamb, a Shepheard; which to affirm, is Blasphemy: if he makes a difference, how does the Scripture compare Christ to things so infinitely beneath him? Now if he saies, that these things, though

though infinitely beneath Christ, yet in some of their Properties may resemble him, and his virtues; and upon that account he is compared unto them, without any blemish, or reflexion upon his honour; why might not we, without reflecting any dishonour upon Christ, say, that Saint *Francis*, Saint *Ignatius*, and other Canonized Saints of the *Roman* Church, do in their Virtues, Miracles, and Practises, resemble those of Christ, and his Apostles, though infinitely above them?

Besides, 'tis manifest, that Christ, and his works, as being an infinite value, derived from the dignity of the person, were far more above the Apostles, and their works, than those were above the particular Saints of the *Roman* Church, and their practices: notwithstanding we have the same Inducements, and Topicks, to believe the matters of Fact, of the Apostles and Prophets, as those of Christ, though so far beyond them: and whoever should deny the former, without doubt he would open a way to deny the latter. Although therefore the practises, and

Reve-

Revelations of the particular Saints of the *Roman* Church be, in ſeveral Circumſtances inferiour to thoſe of the Apoſtles, and Prophets; yet there may be the ſame Motives, and Inducements, (we ſpeak antecedently to Scripture, taken as the word of God, as when we prove againſt Pagans the Miracles of Chriſt and his Apoſtles) to believe the one as the other: So that ſhould one deny the Virtues, Revelations, and Practiſes, conſtantly related, and believed, concerning the *Roman* Saints, and approved by our Church, (for of ſuch Virtues, Revelations, and Practiſes we ſpeak in this preſent debate) he would, doubtleſs, give a great occaſion to Pagans, to deny, or queſtion, the Virtues, Revelations, and Practiſes of the Apoſtles, and Prophets. The reaſon is, becauſe the ſame Motives, Inducements, and Topicks, may ſerve for the belief of things very different one from another; which is what I pretended: and if they are of no force in the one, neither are they in the other. Yet one would think, that the harder the thing is, and the more ſublime, the ſtronger Inducements

are

are requiſite to believe it. So that, if the unanimous conſent of ſo many learned, and pious men is not ſufficient to induce a Proteſtant to believe the practiſes, and tranſactions of St. *Bennet*, St. *Dominick*, St. *Francis*, and St. *Ignatius*, handed down by ſo general a Tradition, and of a far freſher date, how ſhall the like conſent be ſufficient to induce Pagans, to believe the works of Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, far more wonderful, and of a ſtaler date? For commonly, matters of Fact of a freſh date are more eaſily prov'd, and believed, than of a ſtaler. The difference therefore inculcated by Dr. *St.* between Chriſt and his Apoſtles on the one ſide, and the proper Saints of the *Roman* Church on the other, and the Superminency of the former above the latter, is ſo far from diminiſhing the force of our Argument, that it rather increaſes it.

Again, Dr. *St.* and his Partizans, commonly defend, that the certainty we have, that ſuch Books are Scripture, and that they were penned by ſuch Writers, whoſe names are prefixed unto them, is of the ſame nature with the cer-

certainty, that we have, that such Books were written by *Titus Livius*, or *Plutarch*, which are unanimously assented unto, as *Titus Livius*, or *Plutarch*'s Works: and the certainty we have, that there have been such men as Christ, his Apostles, and that they did such and such things, which are commonly ascribed unto them, with the certainty we have, that there have been in the world such men, as *William the Conquerour*, *Julius Cæsar*, and *Henry* the *Eighth*, and that they have done such things, as unanimously are attributed unto them. So that whoever should deny all such meer Humane Histories, would be in a fair way to deny, that ever there have been such men as Christ, and his Apostles; or that they have done such things, which Christians unanimously ascribe unto them.

This Doctrine supposed, (whether true or false I do not now dispute) I would once more fain know of the Dr. whether he *does in earnest make no difference between the Books of Scripture, and the Books of* Livy, *and* Plutarch; between Christ and his Apostles, and their Practises,

Practiſes, and *William* the Conqueror, *Julius Caſar*, *Henry* the *Eighth*, Practiſes? if not, *then we know who they are, that expoſe Chriſtian Religion to purpoſe:* if he does make a difference, how does he make this Parallel, between things, ſo far eſtranged the one from the other? and if he ſaies, the Parallel he makes is not between the perſons, or things themſelves, but between the certainty of the one and the other; (and there may be, without doubt, the ſame kind of certainty concerning things very different) let him apply to the ſame anſwer to his Argument made againſt us, and he will ſee, how it comes to nothing. For what we pretend, is, that there is the ſame, or the like certainty, the ſame, or the like motives, and inducements (we ſpeak here antecedently to Scripture *held to be the word of God*; for ſuch it is not held to be by Pagans) to believe, that there have been ſuch men, as St. *Bennet*, St. *Dominick*, St. *Francis*, St. *Ignatius*, and that they have done ſuch things, as are unanimouſly attributed unto them by *Roman* Catholicks, without any heſitation, as that there have

have been ſuch men as Chriſt and his Apoſtles; and that they have done ſuch things as are univerſally aſcribed unto them by Chriſtians. So that whoever ſhould deny, that there was ever ſuch a man as St. *Bennet*, or that he ever founded any Order of Religious men, he might eaſily in the like manner be brought to queſtion, or deny, that there ever was any ſuch man as Chriſt, or that he ever founded Chriſtian Religion: there being the ſame, or the like evidence for the one, as for the other, antecedently to Scripture owned as the Word of God; *viz.* a conſtant Tradition of men; although Chriſt, and Chriſtian Religion be far above St. *Bennet*, and his Order.

I do not deny, but that there is a more Univerſal Tradition for the Miracles, and Tranſactions of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, than for the particular Actions and Miracles, of the forementioned *Roman* Saints. But what then? may there not be ſeveral degrees in the ſame kind of certainty? Proteſtants aver, as we have ſeen, that there is the ſame kind of certainty, and evidence, againſt

a

a Pagan for the Miracles of Chriſt, as for the Actions of *Alexander* the Great, and *Julius Cæſar*, though theſe are attended upon by a more Univerſal Tradition; ſince Jews and Pagans, who deny Chriſts Miracles, aſſent unto the Actions of *Alexander* the Great, and *Julius Cæſar:* and yet both we, and Proteſtants affirm, that they may as well deny, or queſtion the one as the other.

Moreover, there is Tradition enough to induce a Moral certainty for all, and every Book of the Scripture: and yet doubtleſs there is a more general Tradition for ſome Books of Scripture, than for others; for the Old Teſtament, than for the New; and for ſome parts of the New, than for others. In the like manner, though the Tradition for Chriſts, and his Apoſtles Miracles, be more general, than for the Miracles of the abovementioned *Roman* Saints, approved of by our Church; yet the Tradition for theſe is ſo general, that it renders them Morally certain: ſo that whoever proceeds rationally, upon the account of Humane Tradition, will either allow both, or neither. Let's ſuppoſe, that there

there are in the world a hundred Millions of Chriſtians; and that threeſcore Millions of them are *Roman* Catholicks: For even Proteſtants confeſs, that *Roman* Catholicks alone make up the Major part of Chriſtendome. Now whoever has the confidence to deny the Miracles of St. *Bennet*, though aſſented unto by ſo many Millions of *Roman* Catholicks, and for the ſpace of above a Thouſand years, he would not ſtick, ſhould the like paſſion carry him that way, to queſtion the Miracles of Chriſt, and his Apoſtles, though agreed on by the whole Body of Chriſtians, and for the ſpace of above a Thouſand, and ſix Hundred years. Can we imagin, that any prudent man does now believe the Miracles of Chriſt, becauſe there is ſuch a preciſe number in the world (and no leſſer) of Chriſtians, who aſſent unto them, or rather becauſe there is a vaſt number of Chriſtians, that unanimouſly aſſert them? and certainly the number of Catholicks alone is a vaſt number. Or would it not be a madneſs for one to ſay, That were there no more Chriſtians in the world, to atteſt the Mira-

Miracles of Chriſt, than there are *Roman* Catholicks, he would not think himſelf obliged to believe them upon account of Tradition, and conſent in their favour: when as 'tis certain, there was a time, when there were no more Chriſtians in the world, than now there are *Roman* Catholicks: and yet even then, doubtleſs, there was Tradition, and Conſent, ſufficient to render the Miracles of Chriſt, and his Apoſtles unqueſtionable.

And thus far concerning the Parallel between the Miracles, and Practiſes of Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and thoſe of *Roman* Canonized Saints: ſuppoſing the Actions of the latter to be inferiour (as really they are in ſeveral Circumſtances) to thoſe of the former. Yet our Saviour expreſsly ſaies, *John* 14. 12. *I ſay unto you, He that believes in me, the works that I do, he ſhall do; and greater works than theſe ſhall he do:* which words, even according to *Calvin*, and other Sectaries, extend not only to the Apoſtles, but alſo to the whole Body of the Church in ſucceeding Ages. So that, not only the Miracles, and practiſes of the

Apoſtles, but alſo thoſe of modern Saints of the *Roman* Church, conſidered in themſelves, are as great, or greater, than thoſe of Chriſt. Did Chriſt do Miracles, raiſing the Dead, caſting out Devils, curing ſuddenly the Lame, the Deaf, the Dumb, and others infected with incurable Diſeaſes? So did the Apoſtles, and ſeveral Apoſtolical men of the *Roman* Church. Did Chriſt Foretel things to come? So did the Apoſtles, and *Roman* Saints. Did Chriſt Convert many with his Preaching? So did the Apoſtles, and ſeveral Saints of the *Roman* Church. Was Chriſt a Pattern of Charity, Humility, Patience, and all other Virtues? The Apoſtles, and many famous *Roman* Saints have imitated his Virtues: Notwithſtanding what Chriſt did, he did it by his own power, being Omnipotent; but what the Apoſtles, and other Apoſtolical men did in this kind, they did it by the vertue, and power Chriſt liberally conferred upon them. And therefore Chriſt was the Principal Agent of all ſuch works.

Now let any one judge, whether the Parallel between the Inducements we have

have to be Christians, and those, which we have to be Catholicks; and the certainty of both, antecedently to Scripture *owned as the word of God*, be so unreasonable, as that only with an Admiration or two, Dr. *St.* could prudently think to blow it off. Wherefore I repeat what I have already said, That the Drs. Objections against *Roman* Catholicks will assoon make one no Christian, as no Catholick.

And as for several Extravagant, abstruse, and mystical expressions, he alledges out of the Revelations, and Visions of Canonized Saints of the *Roman* Church, branding them for Fanaticisme, the Dr. might, as I insinuated in my Book, produce out of the Revelations of St. *John*, and the *Canticles*, (which upon this account are dash'd out of the Canon of Scriptures by some Protestants) quite as strange, and extraordinary expressions, and Practises. But Dr. *St.* is of those men, who whatever they understand not, they Blaspheme; and he is as unacquainted with mystical Divinity, as with other Faculties; which he has a greater obligation to know. Now if the

Canticles, and *Apocalypſe* are ſufficiently cleared from Fanaticiſme, notwithſtanding ſo many ſtrange, and abſtruſe expreſſions they continue, becauſe they are approved of by the greateſt part of Chriſtians: alſo the Revelations of St. *Bridgit*, St. *Catherine*, and St. *Tereſa*, are cleared from the like Aſperſion, becauſe they are countenanced by the *Major* part of Chriſtendome, *viz.* the *Roman* Catholick Church: which, according to Dr. *St.*'s conceſſion is a True Church. And ſure the approbation of a True Church, and ſo much extended, as the *Roman* Church is, is ſufficient to excuſe particular waies of Devotions, and particular Revelations from the imputation of Fanaticiſme; which neceſſarily implies a Reſiſtance againſt all Lawful, and competent Authority.

Neither did I ever affirm in my Book, as Dr. *St.* groſsly miſtakes me, That Divine Authority, manifeſted by Miracles, is not ſufficient, to clear particular manners, of preaching or Praying, from Fanaticiſme; as it happened to the Prophets, and Apoſtles, as I ſhewed above. Yea my Third Propoſition, *pag.* 9. was,

That

That *the Aathority competent* (and by a competent Authority I underſtand a Lawful Authority) *to clear particular waies, and practiſes, from Fanaticiſme, is not neceßarily Divine*; as I prove there, with ſeveral inſtances. And certainly, Thoſe words clearly ſignifie, that I thought, the forementioned Authority might be Divine, But ſuch are the Arts Dr. *St.* uſes, in anſwering his Adverſaries. He miſtakes ſome places; he takes no notice of others; and he blunders over others: and it is a great wonder, how frequently he makes uſe of theſe Artifices, in the Examination of my Book, though ſo ſhort.

I ſhall cloſe up the whole Diſcourſe, with an addreſs to Dr. *St.*'s Friends, (perhaps I ſhall have better luck with them, than I have had with the Dr. himſelf, in the favours I requeſted at his hands) entreating them,

Firſt, That as they tender the Honor of our Nation, (wherein Dr. *St.* bears ſo great a ſway) and the Credit of that famous Univerſity, whereof he is a Member, they would find out one way or other, to purge his brains from this peſtilent

peſtilent Humour of Self-contradiction; which infects all his Works, in ſuch a manner, that they ſeem to be nothing elſe, but ſo many Bundles of notorious Contradictions. This procedure of Dr. *St.* is a ſhrewd conjecture, that the Report which goes about, is true, *viz.* That Dr. *St.* had only the penning of thoſe Books, which he has ſet forth; and that the Matter was ſuppeditated unto him from ſeveral Authors; who were wiſer than to publiſh ſuch things themſelves; and the good Dr. without ever conſidering the coherency of one thing with another, huddles all together, dreſſes it with Drollery, Flurts, and Gawdy Expreſſions, and then preſents it to publick View. For it ſeems impoſſible, that one Author, if he has an eye to what he writes, ſhould commit ſuch palpable Contradictions: whereas 'tis no wonder, that different Authors ſhoud Contradict one another.

Secondly, That ſince the Dr. as it ſeems miſpent the time that he ſhould have employed in learning Logick, in the peruſal of Play-books, and Romances; they would procure ſome Univerſity-

ſity-man to teach him the Rules of Rational Diſcourſes. For it is a great affront for a Dr. of Divinity, to be ſo deficient, as we have proved him to be, even in the very Rudiments of Rationality: and if the Dr. ſaies, that *it is too late for him to learn ſuch things*, then they may perſwade him to leave off Writing. Yea, who forced him to begin, when he knew himſelf unacquainted with ſo neceſſary a Faculty, for ſuch as write Polemical Diſcourſes? Has not the Church of *England* other men, who underſtand the Rules of Logick, able to write in Vindication of Proteſtancy?

Thirdly, That they would obtain of the Dr. if he be yet reſolved to write more Books of Controverſies, to lay aſide Railery, unleſs he pretends to be, not the Champion, but the Buffoon, of the Proteſtant Church. Let him try whether he be not able to write ſomething, which though deveſted of all thoſe *little Arts*, he has hitherto made uſe of to ſet of his Works, may deſerve, not to lie upon the Stalls to be beſpatter'd with the dirt of Coach-wheels, and to be ſold off at laſt for waſt-paper.

FINIS.